

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXV, 3.

WHOLE No. 139.

I.—VARRONIANA.

DE LINGUA LATINA.

*Part II.*

[CONCLUDED FROM A. J. P. XXXV 162.]

BOOK VI.

2. Old form, d/l: ab sodu (ms. *solu*) solum. Varro reckoned with the d/l variation in V. 123, lepestaie . . . δεπέσταν.

4. Lacunae supplied: mundus. <sub> d<i>uo motus <is> casu LOr is *casu* a gloss for *usu*? J venit. Was *sub* written *sud* before *dio*? Interpretation, punctuation: The relative clause quod . . . inumbravit seems to refer to shading a sun-porch (*solarium*). What precedes is *solarium dictum id in quo horae in sole inspiciebantur*, wherein *solarium* is certainly a sun dial. There may be a lacuna after *inspiciebantur*, though I would use a colon—unless Varro was playing on the equivoque in *solarium*. Derivation; the hapax *turdelice*: In R. R. 3. 5. 1 sq. Varro describes a breeding house for *turdi*, without ever calling it a *turdarium*, the word he uses in our present section. Describing the door or entrance (3. 5. 3), he says: ostium habere . . . potissimum eius generis quod cocliam appellant. With *coclia* cf. ἐλίκη 'the convolution of a spiral shell, as of snails'. Thus it would appear that *turd-elice* is a hybrid compound, describing the door of a *turdarium* as a 'thrush-spiral'.

7. Diction: *inconcubium*, however easy it is to correct to [in]concupium, looks like a confluent from *in concubio* (sc. quasi tempus).

8. Insertion: aut quod <quom> ad nos versum proximum <stat> est solstitium.

9. Punctuation; Varronian footnote (see on v. 20): quod tum multi imbres Lhinc (i. e. a hieme) hibernacula, hibernum.] vel etc.

10. Lacuna supplied: quartum au<c>tumnus <cum auctum omne> ab sole, sicut (not sic[ut]) etc. For the general sense cf. Catullus 62, 44: quem <florem> mulcent aurae, firmat sol, educat imber. Punctuation, insertion: dum ab sole profecta rursus redit ad eum [. ] luna, <nisi> quod etc.

16. Ductus, t/r: (see VII, 28) flamen potus (not porus). I assume in capitals a confusion of T with P, then of P and R; cf. totius for potius in v. 61, hecralem for h<a>ec Palem in v. 74.

21. Excisions: quo di[d]e[o] actum for quod ideo a.

23. Etymology of *quinquatrus*; insertions; T/P/L: publice parentant e sexto die (sc. Saturnalium) qui atra dicitur <. eam dicunt> diem parentum (ms. t-) Accas Larentinas (ms. t). I render e sexto die (-e added to *parentant* in ms.) by 'the sixth day after', believing the phrase to be like a. d. VI. etc. For the combination of *ater* with *dies* all the indispensable information is collected in Thes. II, 1021, 21 sq. Gruppe and Wissowa rightly connect this *ater* with *Quinquatrus* etc. Cf. supra §14: *Quinquatrus*: hic dies unus ab nominis errore observatur proinde ut sint quinque dictus . . sic hic, quod erat post diem quintum idus quinquatrus. The day after any of the three division points of Kalends Nones Ides was *ater* (see §29), cf. Afranius, com. 163, Semptembris heri Kalendae, hodie ater dies. Nothing so conforms to sense as to correlate *āter* (*āter* by popular etymology) with the sept of English *after*, from a startform *āp(o)teros*, whence *a(p)tros* cf. *vi(p)tricus* 'step-father' (see Fay, Prellwitz, Schulze ap. Walde<sup>2</sup> s. v.). In *quinquatrus* we have dissimilation from *quint(um) atrum*, e. g. When the nominative was in the stage *atros*, assimilation in number also to *Idus* took place. But an Italic doublet -tro-/-tru- is also found in Lat. *castrum*: Osc.-Umbr. *kastru-*.

24. Syntax; ut quod = ὡς ὅτι (Plutarch); punctuation: hoc sacrificium fit in Velabro qu[i]a in novam viam exitur, ut aiunt quidam ad sepulchrum Accae, ut quod ibi[;] prope

faciunt etc. For the syntax of *ibi prope* cf. *prope alicubi* (Cicero, Fam. 9. 7. 1). Inconcinnity; capitalize: [†] Paganalibus. The nominative Paganalia would better correspond with the foregoing *feriae*.

26. Ductus, I/E: omnis [†] pagus; pagus is collective as in Horace C. 3. 18. 11; Ovid, F. 1. 669, but here has a plural verb.

29. Insertion: quod tum ut [†] esset popul<o i>us constitutum est etc. Cf. *ius non est*, infra §53.

31. Ms. defended: ab eo quod eo die rex sacrific[i]ulus [†] dicat ad comitium. For *dicat* 'proclaims' cf. §61; also Thes. v, 964, 3 sq. Here *ad consilium* = *apud c.*

41. Lacuna supplied: hinc 'agitur pecus pastum', <hinc ambagines>, qu[i]a vix agi potest. Cf. the glosses *ambagines* loca flexuosa, *ambages* incertum iter.

44. Ms. retained: [†] reminisci.

45. Insertion: hinc etiam 'metuo, mentem <teneo> quodam modo motam' [cf. the gloss *mensit* 'timet'] vel 'metuis, te (ms. *metuisti*) amovisti'. The single quotes are mine. With *te amovisti* cf. Titinius, com. 45, *parasitos amovi, lenonem aedibus absterrui*; Donatus on *Ad.* 553, *mire 'amovebo' dixit; non 'deterrebo'*. In the citation 'metuo . . motam' we have 4 trochees + 1½ of the second phrase of a long verse (septenarius or octonarius).

48. Emendation accepted (GS): cum <pavit cor,> pavit; et ab eo pavor.

49. Emendation accepted (after Conal and others): cum id quod remansit in mente init (ms. in id) <rursus> quod rursus movetur.

50. Compendium: *maerere a marcere quo[d]* (sc. *maerendo*) etiam *corpus marcescit* (ms. °*ere*). The infinitive is due to the previous infinitives. Or read *marcescere <dicitur>*, the omitted word having been indicated by *dr* (see proleg. p. xviii and on v. 95).

52. Interpretation; insertion: cum hoc vocabulorum a similitudine vocis pueri, <Fatuo> ac Fatuis (ms. °*us*) fari id dictum. Here *cum hoc* = besides, cf. the locution cum eo quod (ut etc.) ap. Thes. iv, 1367. 16 sq.; Celsus 7. 27: cum eo tamen, quod non ignoremus, orto cancro saepe affici stomachum. This locution is generally restrictive in sense, but the

subjunctive, as in Cicero's letters, is not due to the restrictive idea, for Quintilian (v. exx. ap. Thes. l. c.) uses the indicative. The restrictive sense is a connotation, as in English *withal* or *for all that*. As for the rendering 'besides', note Weissenborn's rendering in Livy 8. 12. 16 by "mit dem zusatz". The present passage means:

"Moreover, from the likeness of <their> calls to the cry of a child, unto <the god> Fatuus and the Fatuae said term *fari* is applied".

The *cum eo* formula is earliest of record in the Poenulus 536, echoed for humorous purposes in 858, where we find *q u o m e o q u o m quiqui*="for (a') that and a' that", as Buecheler convincingly showed in Arch. 1, 279-280.<sup>1</sup>

In conclusion, one word on the orthography of *q u o m e o q u o m quique*: it is quite amiss to transcribe *quom* by *cum* and scarcely enough, with Lindsay, to characterize the spelling of *quom* by the words *antiqua forma*. Buecheler entitled his note on this formula "Zum Kurialstil". Precisely, and *quom* is a curial orthography; note its use in the laws cited ap. Thes. iv, 1339, 82 sq., and recall that, before its gag-like echo, the formula is first used in the Poenulus by *advocati*. I have elsewhere shown (AJPh. 33, 397<sup>1</sup>) how the spelling with *qu-* may prove not *kw-* - but *kw-*.]

<sup>1</sup> This solution of the old puzzle by interpretation instead of emendation is a thing to impress upon pupils in textual criticism. Along with this instance it would be profitable to consider all the wild emendations that even sober scholars—though Robinson Ellis seems to have divined the truth—proposed for Most. 852, *quam feta quaevis*. Here CD presented every letter intact except the *e* of *quaevis*, and none of the string of emendations with *agna* or *aqua* ought ever to have been proposed, especially in view of Ennius, Ann. 518 (Vahlen<sup>1</sup>), *tantidem quasi feta canes sine dentibus latrat*, a parallel passage that seems to have been reserved for my edition first to mention. Similarly the *embaeneticam* of Cicero, Fam. 8. 1. 4 was always right. Another instructive illustration of the value of exhausting the simplest ductus emendations is furnished by Ellis's correction of *erit* to *frit* in Most. 595. Varro's book on agriculture (r. r. 1. 48. 3) had recorded the word *frit* with perfect clarity and all the *γρῶ*'s etc. of the emenders were quite beside the mark. It was worse than gratuitous when von Planta (Osk.-Umbr. Gram. I. 592) qualified *frit* as "angeblich", a statement incautiously echoed in Walde's lexicon<sup>2</sup> by "wohl verderbt".



52. Old word: *fari* may be an adjective; cf. the gloss *pharii* eloquentes.

54. Orthography, d/t: for *ad quae* read *adque*, i. e. *atque*. Orthography; definition: the ms. spelling *pollutum* for *polluctum* in the context with *profanatum* is due to a connection with *polluere*. It is psychologically interesting to observe how from the phrase *pro fano* the confluent *profanare* 'to consecrate' developed on the one hand; and on the other, because *pro fano* was *extra fanum*, the precisely counter sense of 'to desecrate'. If Varro himself spelt *pollutum*, it raises a question of the age of the sense 'to desecrate', and a correlated question of the antiquity of the Italianate assimilation of *ct* to *tt*. Cf. also on vii, 65.

56. Compendium, um/us: *is tum* (ms. *istum*) *prolocutus* (ms. *um*).

57. Ductus, u/n, P/C: for *ita <ut>inter se †condeant aliud alii* read *ita ute<i> r<e>s <res>pondeant* etc. It is not necessary to correct *aliud* to *alia* (*res*).

61. Ennius correction, o/q (cf. on vii, 92), m/ai: for 'DICO QUI HUNC DICARE' read DICO [Q]VI. HUNC DICARE <METAS>. The reason for supplying *metas* is because Festus (140, 17) gives this citation under the lemma *meta*. In Festus *ait Ennius* follows *dicare*, and the likeness of M/AI (see on v. 166) may account for his skipping over *metas* to *ait*. Ennius may have been describing the promise to dedicate a circus with its six (vi=*sex*) *metae*. Proof that the race course had six *metae* in Ennius' time is hardly necessary, but Livy (41. 27. 6) records their repair in the year 194-193, and it is tantalizing to find in the solitary ms. of that decade *et metas trans* followed by—a gap! The correction of *trans* to T<E>RNAS, referring to the group of *metae* at each end of the race course, is self-suggesting. The probably contemporary Ennius passage may refer to this restoration of the *metae*. We make a senarius—for his *Saturae*—by writing *dico sex hunc dicare metas circulo* (or *circuli*), though another case of the diminutive is not of record in this sense. If we supply *circulum* as its subject *└circum metulas?┐ dicare* will have the sense *δεικνύειν* as demanded by our context (see also vi, 31; viii, 65). Then the senarius will have belonged to a comedy of Ennius, and *circulus* have the sense of *circus* in the Plautine citation

in V. 153. In Miles 991 the oncoming boastful soldier is spoken of, with somewhat less personification, as a 'circus' and the figure lives in English in the turn "a perfect circus" or "a regular show". Supposing the comic endowment of Ennius capable of extending the Plautine figure, our senarius will describe a "circus" of a man so perfect as to exhibit six *metae*. As our citation stands, it is much less complete—it makes no sensible phrase—than the Varronian wont. Possibly the omission of *metas* was euphemistic. See on its meaning AJPh. 34. 30<sup>1</sup>.

61. Definition: *indicit* (illum) = 'declared against', reflecting the sense of *indicium*. Lacuna supplied: hinc in manipulis castrensibus <dictata a> ducibus; hinc dictata in ludo. The first *dictata* might be a soldier's name for the commands given in drilling; cf. exx. ap. Thes. v. 1014, 14 of dictata in ludo lanistae. But perhaps *dictata ducibus* should be read referring to testamenta in procinctu. Such verbal declarations would naturally have been made to officers, who may have taken memoranda thereof.

62. Varronian etymology, *doceo/dūco*: . . ductor; <hinc doctor> qui ita inducit ut doceat. ab ducendo (ms. -o-) docere . . . ab eodem principio documenta, quae exempla ducendi (ms. -o-) causa dicuntur. The synonymity of *docet* and *edūcat* could hardly have failed of being noted in some form by Varro.

64. After Mommsen: sic auc<tores i>uris dicunt: si mihi auctor est *et tibi una* (ms. *verbi nam*) manum asserere dicei (ms. °it) consortes.

69. Insertions: nam id <idem> valet et a voluntate. . . . spondeo; <qui de>spondit est sponsor; qui <uti i>dem faciat obligatur etc.

70. Insertion, punctuation: . . 'consponsi'. <si> spondebatur . . . causa, (not;) appellabatur etc. Ductus, a/o: cui desponsa qua (not quo) erat.

71. Insertion: non enim, si volebat, <alii> dabat etc.

72. Insertion: a qu<o quom su>a sponte [†] dicare <'spondere'> tum (ms. *cum*) <re>spondere quoque dixerunt, cum a<d> sponte<m> etc. Or is a *sponte* right?

75. Interpretation: omnium enim horum [†] quod a canere. *quod* is indefinite = *aliquid*, in a stricter Latinity than Varro's.

In his r. r. the forms without *ali-* are of much wider range than our grammar rule admits.

76. Ductus, r/si: cum proportione. Cf. for the general use Festus (332. 9) as here emended: Penatis singulariter Labeo Antistius posse dici putat, quia pluraliter Penates dicuntur, cum patiat *<pro>* portio etiam Penas dici ut optimas primas Antias.

78. Lacuna supplied: non esse inficientem. *<focillator, faculam>* qui adlucet dicitur. GS. suggest *<et facere lumen>*. I compare Persa, 515:

... nescis

quam tibi Fortuna faculam lucrifera[m] adlucere volt.

Note the gloss *focillat* fovet, reficit.

80. Hapax: [†]vigilium. Cf. in general on V. 18, and V. 4. Insertions; C/D; Accius: [†]et Acci (ms. -tt-) *<illud>*:

cum illuc [†] oblivio lavit qui incidit invidendum,

For *illuc* cf. Amph. 270, Eun. 782; *illuc* suggests *facinus* (*factum*), *qui*=si quis (or eius qui).

82. Insertion: di*<spicio>* des[t] picio.

84. Punctuation: This section should begin thus: sic ab ore<:> edo etc.

85. Lacuna questioned: mantelium, ubi manus terguntur [\*\*\*]. Varro has been dealing in § 85 with *manus* 'hand, band', and its kin. He abruptly announces in § 86 his intention of citing from the censors' tabulae, and carries the citation on through § 95. The entire passage turns chiefly on proving the sense of *illicium*='embandment'—suggested to him by *manus* 'band' of course. From the beginning of ch. X (§ 96 sq.) Varro's exhaustion with the subject of book VI, viz.: de vocabulis temporum, is evident. The long citation of ch. IX (§§ 86-95) attests the same weariness, which made Varro deliberately—and abruptly—resort to padding from his antiquarian collections.

91. After Mommsen: for auspicio †orande sed read auspicio o*<pe>*ram des <;> d*<um>* etc. Here *dum* is one of a pair, each construed with an archaic 2d sg. pres. subj. of command. The double *dum* was correctly analyzed by Quintilian 9. 3. 16; cf. Schmalz, Gram.<sup>4</sup> § 317. The original use of *dum* L not from *dōm* perhaps, but from *dowom*, a masculine

form parallel to Alkman's  $\delta\omicron\acute{\alpha}\nu$  'die weile', (cf. Osthoff in IF. 5. 280 sq.); from *dovom* we should have \**dōm*, but enclitic -*dum*—unless *dum* is rather from \**dwom* as  $\delta\eta\nu$  from \* $\delta(\acute{f})\acute{\alpha}\nu$ —in pairs accounts for the use of the pairing negative *nec* in its compound *dōnec* (cf. Fay, Cl. Quart. 4, 81<sup>2</sup>), whose long  $\acute{o}$  is now genuinely accounted for. On the pairing use of *sic sic* see on X. 41.

91. Definition: *commeatus* 'companion'. Cf. the gloss *commeatum* viaticum aut comitem itineris id est oratione (lege orator) [et gratia], GRATIA being dittographic for ORATIO. The -*ne* of *oratione* will be from a marginal *vel* (also found in *et*) that stood before *gratia*; *oratio* was due to a compendium for the final syllable in *orator*. Old gen. in -*es*: (1st) *praetores*. Punctuation: *exquaeras* [,] *consules praetores tribunosque plebis collegasque tuos* <,> [†] *et* etc.

93. Insertion: *quae interea fieri* <scripta sunt, fieri> *illicium scriptum est*. Or *quae interea* <fiant>; *fieri illici* <um> *tum* etc.

95. Punctuation; insertions: *commentariis* <.> *quod tamen* [†] *ibidem est* <'> *quod illicite illexit* <fit> *qu* <i> *a* *I* (ms. *quae*) *cum E et C cum G magnam habet co* <m> *munitatem*.

96. Greek script: *I ab he* (lege  $\acute{o}\iota$ ) . . . *praeterea*  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$   $\psi\epsilon\varsigma$  (lege *praeterea* <abs et exs> *ab*  $\acute{\alpha}\psi$  <et>  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi$  <.>) GS. correct to p. a  $\delta\epsilon\psi\eta\sigma<\alpha\iota$  *depsere*>, which would be certain if we could really convince ourselves that Varro did not interject preposition examples between the verbs of the *praeterea* clause.

## BOOK VII.

1. Insertion: . . . *repens* <se> *ruina operuit* <:> is possible. Insertion, punctuation: *f/s*: *inde post aliqua dempta* <obscurius, sc. verbum> *fit* (GS. *si* [†]), *obscurior* (ms.  $\circ\mu\varsigma$ ) *fit voluntas impos* <i> *t[eri]oris* <,> (not.) *non reprehendendum* etc.

3. Insertion; ductus, E/P, s/r: *non modo Epimenides* <e s> *opor* <e> *post annos L experrectus*. The second <E> was lost by haplography before P in a thin capital ms.; on s/r in our ms. see GS. proleg. XXVI. Ductus, a/i n/r;  $\delta\iota$  *a compendium* (see V. 95): *quo* (sc. tempore) *Romanorum prima verba poetica dicunt* <di> *latari* (ms. *latina*); cf. the gloss *dilatatum* aliquid recens in posterum dimissum.

4. Lacuna supplied: ut [†] qui a<c> quare <a>r[e]s m<agica> (ms. u . . . .) ad medendum medicinâ <attineat>.

5. Compendia: for dis read sed ita. Punctuation: grato <.> (not ,).

8. Ancient formula: It was long ago pointed out that in the ancient formula here transcribed *me* and *te* are datives (= *μοι σοι*, Lat. *mī*; cf. the expanded forms *mi<s>* and *ti<s>*, functioning as genitives). The inconcinnate *eas* referring grammatically to *templa tescaque* may really refer, in the speaker's mind, to *arbos* later on. The correction of *templum tescumquem festo* to *t. tescumque me esto* is inexpugnable: *diutius dubitare, id quod equidem minime reverentiae aliorum securus dixerim, est pervicacis non diligentis*. Old dative-nominatives in *-e -ei*: *conregione conspicione cortumione* (see § 9) are used like *frugi*, see on V. 131. Ellipsis of *loca sunt* might be admitted in the formula. Other archaic forms: *quirquir*. The contention that this is an adverb and not for *quisquis* is not past doubt. In the sing-song formula, *quisquisest* may have given *quisquirest*, and by continued assimilation of its parts *quirquir est*.—*ollaber arbos . . . ollaner arbos*: A genuine attempt to explain these words seems not to have been made. The difference of *o-* and *u-* is too elementary to call for notice (*olla-* : *ollus, ōlim*), and *-ner* is but a copyist's *-uer* (cf. IX, 95) for *-ber* (cf. e. g. Havet, *Man. Crit. Verb.* § 928). The termination *-ber* is adverbial, from IE *dhra\** (cf. on Lat. *-ter*: Skr. *-tra* in KZ, 42, 382; 43, 120), but attached to declinable *ollo-* (here *olla*), cf. *ōde ṛde* etc. IE *dhra* is established by Goth. *hwa-drē* 'wohin', now explained by Verner's law as containing a *-tr* termination, cf. *hwa-prō* 'woher'. But the assumption of accentual difference in these words, however defended by instancing Skr. *ātra* : *satrā*, does not accord with the identical vocalism of their prius (*hwa-*). That *hwa-drē* has *d* from *dh* is proved by the Vedic hapax *a-kudhrī-ak* 'ziel-los', i. e. 'nequō-(uo)-rsus' ('nicht-wohin-gerichtet'). With *-kudhri-* 'wohin', cf. Vedic *sa-dhrī* (advb.) 'einem ziele (mittelpunkte) zu'. Thus *ollaber* is a sort of 'illō-versus', a fuller sort of 'illa' (= *yon*, cf. *yon-d e r*, Goth. *jain-drē*).

8. Concinnity: <in> *dextrum* would more properly match the previous *in sinistrum*, but is not necessary.



9. Etymology: *cortumione* = the heart-cutting, with sequel meaning (cf. AJPh. 32, 414, §21) of 'inspecting'; or cf. *tueri*?

10. Lacuna questioned: *sed hoc ut putarent aedem sacram esse templum* [\*] *es[se]<t> factum*.

12. Lacuna supplied: <'>bell<a tuerei> et <'>tueri villam<'>. GS. delete *villam* which leaves them no transition to *aedituum*, a couple of lines later.

14. Accius' emendation: insertions: *pervade polum, splendida mundi | sidera, bigis, <signis> continu- | i<s> se<x> ex>cepti<s> spoliis*. The anapaestic lines (4+4+3½) refer to the waxing of the huntress moon through six successive constellations, which she is to take as her spoil (cf. e. g. *excipere aprum*). The idea that Accius sought to express may be the idea contained in the following (where the Zodiac had twenty-eight asterisms): In the Brāhmana period they were distinguished as "deva" and "yama", the fourteen lucky asterisms being probably associated with the waxing, the fourteen unlucky with the waning moon (Encyc. Brit. 28. 996).

— Punctuation; endings confused; *a/ud*: [†] *aliave[:]* *qua re <:>* (not ,) *ut 'signum candens' etc.* For the combination cf. e. g. supra V. 95; Varro's *Menip.* (Buecheler) 374; CIL. I, 206 ap. Thes. III, 326, 58. It is not clear that *signum candens* is a citation; note the recipe for making a 'star' or 'blaze' on cattle in *Mulomed. Chironis* 795.

16. *Ductus, ni/ut*: for *ut[ni]* read <a>*ut ut*. *Manilius* emended; *d/al*: '*Latona pari<e>t casta complexu Iovis | [†] Deli[a] deos geminos, id est Apollinem et Dianam<.> [†] < ;> alii quod etc.*

19. *Ennius* emended, partly after *Ribbeck*: *Areopagitae quia* (ms. *quid*) *dedere <ae>quam pilam* (ms. *-ud-*).

21, end: Insertions; *a/ae*: *ab eo quod Asia<e> et Europa<e> ibi <CŌIVCTIS> colludit mare*. Cf. Thes. I, 1698, 67 for *exx.* of *alludere in mare, litoribus alludere*.

23. *Naevius* emended (*Saturnians*):

*conferreque <rem> aut ratem aeratam qui per liquidum mare solcantes eunt atque s<o>edantes*.

Ms. has *sudantes* for *solcantes*. Perhaps *sulantes* (:συλεύειν) is to be read. For the exaction of ships from the coast towns cf. *Duruy's History of Rome* I. 586 (Boston edition): "*Appius*

Caudex taking advantage of a dark night to send across twenty thousand men on barks and small boats lent by all the cities on the coasts".

25. Interpretation: *cornu* <t>â. This is a collective fem. sg. (abstract in -ta) = 'hornage' (of the bulls, *taurum*).

26. Ennius (Ann. 2 V<sup>2</sup>) emended: *Musas quas memorant, <nos> nosce has* (ms. *nos*) *esse <Camenas>*. For the sentence type cf. *Annales* 193-4: *qui ante hac invicti fuere vivi, pater optime Olympi | hos ego in pugna vici . . .*; 250-1: *prudentem, qui dicta loquive tacereve posset, | hunc inter pugnas Servilius sic compellat*.

27. *Carmen Saliorum*; definition; form in: *empta*, neut. pl. ptc. from *emo* = *capta*; *supplicante*, assimilated in the sing-song to the foregoing *can(i)te*,—or the *n* is introduced from 3d. plur. impv. *supplicanto*.

28. (*Carmen Priami*) *Ductus*, t/r (see vi. 16): '*veteres Casmenas cascarn rem volo profari* (ms. *profari et*). *Papinius* emended (hexameter), P/R, t/s.:

dic[it] *putam* (ms. -su-) <eam> [*puellam*] *rusum* (ms. *pusam*): sic fiet 'mutua muli':

*puellam* was a gloss either on original *putam* or *pusam*.

29. Capitalize: *Forum Vetus*.

30. *Lucilius* (1281 M) emended (hexameter), b/d:

*quid tibi ego ambages <t>am dio scribere coner*.

Ms. *ambiu*. Syntax of *tam dio* as of *tam matulam* e. g. in *Plautus*; cf. *Brix-Niemeyer Miles*<sup>3</sup> 741, making special note of *tam pro nota nominat me*, *ib.* 901. Cf. also on IX. 73, 77. The crystallization of *sub di(v)o* hardly prevents our supposing *Lucilius* to have gone beyond that range. In fact *tam diu* might here mean 'so by day' and *sub diu* meant 'in broad day-light'. The copyist's change of *d* to *b*, if not purely graphic, may have been suggested by the pair *adagio/ambagio* in the next section. On B/D see *Havet, Man. Crit. Verb.* § 600.

38. Etymological query: Does *Epeum fumificum, cocum* furnish a clue to the etymology of Lat. *epulae* 'cena'? *Epeus* was the maker of the Trojan horse, and Eng. *makes* may be cognate with *μάγειρος* 'cook'. *Epeus* was the son of *Παν-ο-πείης* (or should we divide *Παν-ο-πείης*?). Relation with the *opus*-sept is thinkable, cf. *operatur* 'sacrifices'. A sacrifice

was a feast, cf. *voveram dulcis epulas* (Horace, C. 3. 8. 6), and on 107, *infra*. Is it a root EP- 'facere' that has furnished the causative type of Skr. *sthāpayati* 'stare facit'? This root ultimately = *ap* 'vincire'.

39. Deletion; d/t: [†]idem [non item]. The deleted words originally constituted a scribe's marginal warning.

40. Transposition: *neque ursi potius Luc[an]i quam Lu<ca>ni*.

48. Ennius (Ann. 459) emended (with Vahlen, after Müller and Turnebus): read for

*quaeque in corpore causa ceruleo cēlo cortina receptat,*  
*quae cava corpore caeruleo cortina receptat.*

In some prior ms. *quē* was glossed by both *quae* and by *quem* (-*que in*), and the interlinear ossias extended in part over *cava*. In the next copy *cava* was omitted in favor of this *quem* but reinstated as *causa* after *corpore*; *cēlo* represents some compendium for *caeruleo*.

50. Insertion: a quo eam Opillus scribit <vesper> *vesperum ita ut* (for *ita[q]ue*) *dicitur* <alter> *alterum* <.> 'Vesper adest', quem Graeci dicunt di<vum> 'Εσπέριον. Or did Opillus call the star *Vesperum* (neuter)? Cf. Ennius ap. Censor. 24. 4.

52. Lacuna filled; interpretation: ab eo—poetae—milites appellant latrones, <aut> quod item ut milites <sunt, GS.> cum ferro, aut quod latent etc. In deriving *latrones* from *sunt cum ferro* Varro has in mind *latores* i. e. qui ferunt ferrum.

54. Etymology of Oscan *asta* (= 'pile, nap'): quod in ea (sc. lana) h<a>eret neque est lana, quae . . . Naevius appellat *asta* ab Oscis. With *asta* (n. plur.) cf. its Greek synonym ἔξ-αστις. The startform may have been *adsthō*—/*adsthis* 'adstans' (cf. *ad* 'up' in *ad-surgit*?); or *an(a)sthō* etc. cf. Osc. *a(n)stintu*. The Oscan word annihilates the division ἔξ-αστις that I proposed in AJPh. 33. 388.

58. Compendium of *dicunt* (see on V. 95): nam <eu>*m di<cunt>* (ms. *inde*) ad arbitrium etc.

60. Emend, with change of order, after GS.: *eadem<vi> hoc est in Corollaria N<a>evius <usus>*.

63. Plautus, fr. 90; after others:

age, <a té>*rgo specta vīde vivices quantas :: iam inspexi,*  
*quid[em] es[se]t.*

Ductus, a/ci; punctuation: vivices <: > a vi (ms. alii) <v>ex-a[ta]tum verberibus corpus, or read vivices *habet* (for alii)? Varro is explaining *vivices* by *vī vexatum*.

65. Derivation of *s<t>rittabillae*; *ct/tt*: either from *strictā + tibillā* (dimin. of *tibia*) = 'with drawn shanks'; or the posterior *-billae* is an obscene diminutive: Skr. *bila-m* 'hole'. Gellius (3. 3. 6) cites the line (but with *sordidae* instead of *tantulae*) with the characterization "verborum vitia atque deformitates significantium". Italianate *tt* for *ct* may have been of very early usage with some class of the population (see on VI. 54). Ductus, a/ae: ex eo Acci positum curiosa <e>. Accius (430) emended:

reicis abs te religionem <? :: > scrupream imponas  
<tibi?>

Insertion: strittare ab eo qui <se>sistit aegre.

66. Plautus (fr. 116), ms. defended:

mulieres uxor culavit:: ego novi, scio axitiosa  
quam sit.

Here *culavit* = herded, see Fay, Class. Quart. 7, 203.

68. Insertion; a (Lombardic a) = ci/ei etc.: lima enim materia <riei> fabrilis est. Here *fabrilis* is gen. of *fabrile* ('shop'), glossed by χαλκευτήριον. But *materia* <e> *fabrilis* may be right.

69. Definition of *gralator*: in the gloss *gralatores* Πανικὰ φοροῦντες have we a popular interpretation, from omens, as *gravia latores*?

70. Ductus, c/d: mulier ab ludo (c) quae conducetur. As a question of fact was a praefica hired *ab luco* or from the music school, *e ludo*?

—. Compendium, re/er, -tum/-tur: quod fertur esse (ms. *fretum est*) Naevii.

73. Interpretation: [†] culturae. Here = agriculturae. In this context there is no unclearness.

74. Interpretation: dicerentur [†] de tritu. The interpretation (? correction) of dicerentur by dice <i vide> rentur renders all clear. Final d/t: ut ternae trigona faciant [†] aliquot.

83. Definition: et inde [†] enim. Here *enim* = *enimvero*.

85. Text defended: [†] alius aliquotiens. No good reason exists to question this as an additional instance of repeated *ali-* words in sweeping inclusions.

87. Compendium, ut/inter; ductus, as/od: <lymp̄ha> a nympha, <i>nt<er> quas (ms. *quod*) apud Graecos Θέρ̄is.

88. Syntax of suum cuique group: ut suo qui[s]que ritu sacrificium faciat. With *quique* (= *quicque*) here and in IX, 102 cf. suo quique loco, Most. 254 (see my note).

91. Plautus emended:

quod volt <id> densum, ciccum non interduo.

The sense is: "as he wants it (i. e. *mālum* 'a beating', punning on *mālum* sc. Punicum = 'pomegranate') thick, I'll interpose no severant', i. e. *ciccum*, expressly defined by Varro as the dividing membrane that separates the seeds of the pomegranate into compartments. The word is specifically Plautine. It will perhaps be from *cidco*- quasi 'shaving': *caedit* 'cuts'.

93. Ennius (trag. 402) interpreted: heu, mea puella, <i>pse (ms. *spe*) quidem id succenset tibi? Here *ipse* = dominus cf. *ipsa* = domina in Catullus, 3. 7, and Friedrich's note.

94. Lucilius (1118) emended; O/Q (cf. on VI. 61):

atque aliquos <s>ib<e>i <ei> abreptos (ms. *ab rebus*) clepsere foro [q]vi.

*aliquas* (or *aliquot*) *abreptas* is also possible. For the final *vi* cf. *vi abrepto* mancipio (Justin. 8. 13. 26), *abreptae* per vim (Rudens, 690). Prudentius perist. 10, 816 is cited for foro *abripere*. In *clepsere* the note of carrying off is clear. Note Varro's definition by 'corripere', and cf. *agnum a regia clepere* (Accius, trag. 212). A parallel group in Eng. *steals*: Lat. *tollit* 'lifts' (see Fay, JEGPh. 6, 244 sq.).

95. Ductus, *et/-er* (see on VI, 16): unde manducarier (ms. *manducari et*) <.> a quo etc. Insertion: a quo in Atellanis ad obscenum (sc. omen) <Dorssenum> vocant manducum. For the connotation of *omen* cf. Matius in the next line of the Varro text, *obsceni interpretes funestique ominis auctor*; also Ennius, Ann. 563, *contra carinantes verba atque obscena profatus*. Festus (212. 31) defines *obscena* by *verba impudentiā elata*.

96. Insertion (transposition): eam <haut> ut Graeci [aut] Accius scribit sc<a>ena.

97. Insertions: a quo dicitur comitia aliudve quid <quod> sit, <ut> dixi, avi (ms. *aut*) sinistra, <scaeva; sinistra> quae (sc. quasi *vox*) nunc est.



99. Plautus (Ci. 8) emended, t/p:

pol isto quidem nos pretio [p] tanti ést frequentare <infrequentes> ,

followed by an incomplete trochaic octonarius.

101. Ennius (trag. 393) emended, after others:

vocíbus concid<it>e :: fácimus <mus>set ób-rutus.

104. Ennius emended after Vahlen, e/o :: pausam facere <ore> fremendi. 'ore' inserere recusare est pervicacis non diligentis. For the usage cf. Conington's note to Aen. 6. 76. On the confusion of o with e v. exx. ap. proleg. p. xxvi.

— Sueius emended, after others; a/ei: Sueiei (ms. *sueta*) <a merula>: frendi *ec* (ms. *frendice*) frunde et fritinni suaviter. For †sues avoluerat read sueii a volucrib<us> <: > ita tradede<i>

q<u>inque neque iudicio Aesopi nec theatri tri-tiles.

Ms. has ita tradedeq. inreneq. in iudicium etc. We know of Sueius from the third book of Varro's R. R. He was a curule aedile and gave games; by avocation, he was a bird fancier and breeder. He wrote an annalistic work in prose. Lines of his composition are cited by Macrobius in 6. 5. 15; 6. 1. 37, and by Nonius in 72. 25; 132. 27, the last being in trochaic septenarii, as here. The title from which Varro here cites would seem to have been Volucres.—Why not read Maccius instead of Macci[us]?

105. Insertion: in Colace <'nexum'>: 'nexum' etc. Capitalize: Bonam Copiam.

106. Insertion: quod <ad> deliquandum non sunt. For the construction, cf. Poen. 597: verum ad hanc rem agundam Philippum est. Ductus, b/d: a deliquato not ab eliquato.

107. Etymology of *vitulantes*: I derive from *vī[ti]-tulor*. Walde<sup>2</sup> has already suspected a compound with *-tulor*, cf. *gra[ti]-tulor*. In the earliest texts (Ennius reflected in Virgil) *vitulor* = 'I keep holiday' (diem festum ago), modified to 'I bring a thank-offering'. An offering was often a feast (cf. on 38, supra). The prius of *vī[ti]-tulor* = the posterius in Vedic *devá-vīti* - 'götter-mahl'. Definition of *continuitas*: protinam a protinus, c o n t i n u i t a t e m significans. Here *continuitatem* is the abstract to *continuo* 'forthwith, immediately,

without interruption'. Cf. *difficultas* in Cicero, Mur. 19, where it means 'exigency, moroseness', from the very special secondary sense 'morose' found for *difficilis*.

108. Insertion: 'conficiant' <ut> a conficto convenire dictum. After Schoell: 'pecu l<uci>dum' for *pacui dum*.

#### BOOK VIII.

3. Punctuation, insertion: propagatum <.> <lego> legi <c>um declinatum est etc.

7. Insertion; t/b (cf. on vi. 16): voluisse enim puta-<ba>nt. Or read putant<ur> (lost compendium).

9. Ductus, T/E; insertion: causa, inquam, cur tam . . . quam ostendi <est>; sequitur etc. Ductus, t/s (cf. l/s, proleg. p. xxvi;? *monitra/monstra*, Most. 505): vix cras for *vixerat*.

10. Ductus, ta/bi: read *ita* for *ibi* (change not necessary). Definition: *fulmentum* 'prop' = 'qualifier'. Here Varro makes *fulmentum* do duty for *adminiculum* (cf. infra §44), and perhaps he comprises both the other parts of speech save noun and verb; cf. Priscian, ap. Thes. I, 228, 76-77: nomen et verbum solas esse partes orationum, cetera vero adminicula vel iuncturas eorum. A 'prop' (*fulmentum*) is often a brace (quasi *iunctura*). Or did Varro write *iugumentum*? Compendious ending, m'; m/nt: siquae (not †*si quae*) . . . putarem<us> (ms. °nt). But see on IX, 40, 94. The correcter tense were *putemus*, but there has been attraction from *imposita essent*.

11. Ductus, a/o; insertion: quorum generum <rerum> etc.

14. Ms. Terenti is right; the emendation Terenti<a> is wide of the sense. Punctuation: discrimina <:> [†] aut etc. Insertion: <aut> propter multitudinem. Insertion: ab eo <abeo> quod alii dicunt cervices. Here <abeo>=I pass over; cf. Cicero, Orator 112 (ap. Thes. I. 70. 68), ab hoc parumper abeamus. Or read <ab hoc> abeo.

16. Emend after others: sine controversia sunt qui<n>-qu[a]e <ex his>: quis etc. [The case in controversy may have been the vocative. Cf. Muller, de Vet. Imp. Rom. Studiis Etym., p. 50.]

21. Compendium(?); p/f, rt/m: in qua<m> sit *partem* (ms. *fama*). This reading requires us to take *quô* in § 2 as "to what end?"

22. Inconcinnity: Artemidori is for Artemae, if we go by § 21. Does the slip go back to Varro?

27. Interpretation: si ex ea quis (sc. utilitas) id sit consecutus (sc. *es*, or read *consecutu's*).

28. Compendium, non/nostrumst: in his no[n] <strumst> utilitatem quaerere.

31. Lacuna supplied: sed etiam figurâ bellâ atque ab artifice <ficta, or picta>.

32. Lacuna supplied: supellectile distincta quae esset ex ebore <aliisve> [rebus] disparibus figuris. *rebus* was an interlinear gloss over *aliisve*, which it afterwards ousted.

33. Read quaeremus: ut[quis]que <usus>, though a certain sense can be got from *ut quisque*.

35. Compendia(?) omitted: eo iam magis, <non modo contra> analogias etc.

36. Technical brachylogy: for et absolvendo [ab]luo [ab]luam read et <ab luo> 'absolvendi' [abluo ab]luam. Here 'absolvendi' is the definition of *luo*, cf. Cicero, Tusc. I. 87 triste est nomen ipsum 'carendi' (v. Kühner, Gram. II, § 132, ann. 1). For the technical ellipsis of a word like *vox* here cf. the ellipsis with appellandi in § 44. The temptation to brachylogy in the technique of grammar was great, cf. e. g. *tertia enim praeteriti* (sc. quasi forma) in § 51, infra, *multitudinis*, X. 56. Insertions: Plautus et Plautius <Marcius> ... huius Plauti et <Plauti> Marci.

45. Ductus, EI/EF: tertium VTEI F<E>INITVM, ms. *ut effinitum*.

46. Old nom. Iovis: If Ennius had not used this old nominative *ut Iovis* might here easily be changed to *ut [I]ovis*.

51. False analogical forms: Varro notes at the end of this paragraph that the liability of the scribes to error made him restrain himself from positing a greater number of "analogical" forms of the pronouns. The scribes may have erred in *es mulieribus* where *e<ae>s* would rather seem to meet the demands of a purely putative analogy.

56. Insertion: Roma, <ut> Parmenses <sic Albenses Romenses>.

59. Insertion: locuturus <et venaturus, locutus et venatus> etc. What follows in the paragraph demands the citation of a past participle.

60. Ductus, τ/ι, ct/tt (cf. on VI. 54): cantitantes [se] deicitantes (ms. *sed etti*<sup>o</sup>). If this reading is right Varro, or a copyist, has spelt the *ī* of *dictito* after the *ei* of *deico*.

61. Haplogy: the *pisci*<cu>*pem* of GS. may have been to Varro the haplogologic word *piscipem*.

65. Celtic forms: For *alacco alaucus* we should perhaps read *Alacco(s) Alaucu[s]* as the partially Latinized Celtic nominative and dative. Cf. d'Arbois de Jubainville, *Élém. de la gram. Celt.* p. 2 sq. Insertions, interpretation: *sin quod scribunt dīcent* (quasi *ostendant*, see on VI. 61) *quod Poenicum* (sc. *verbum*) *sit* (not *si*<*n*>*t*) *singulis casibus*, *ideo eas litteras graecas* <*singulis casibus*> *nominari*, *sic Graeci nostra . . . debe[b]ant*.

73. Ductus, a/ae: *cum dicatur da patri familia*<*e*>[*s*] *si analogias etc.* Transposition: *non debuerunt dicere* [*da*] *hic pater familias quod est ut* <*da*> *Atinia* . . . *sic una Atinia*.

74. Construct analogy forms: *pro b*<*o*>*u*<*i*>*s bos pro struu*<*i*>*s strues*. Cf. *navis: vaūs*.

75. Compendium; punctuation: *in quo id*<*em*,> *analogias non servari*<, > *apparet*.

76. Inconcinnity: for *caesior caesius caesissimus* Varro probably wrote *caesus caesior caesissimus*, to reject *caesior* as non-existent.

79. Inconcinnity: *ut cista cistula cistella*, <*alia*> *in mediis non sunt*, not concinnate with the following *item minima in quibusdam non sunt*. Still *alia in mediis non sunt* seems intelligible for *alia mediis carent* (=the second term lacks in some).

80. Lacuna supplied: *debut esse* <*Roma, ita Perpennia, quae debuit esse*> *Perpenni filia, non Perpennae*.

84. end: Lacuna partially supplied: *nominum* <*proportionem*>. \* \* \* \*

#### BOOK IX.

1. Lacuna supplied, in part by Vahlen: *qui reliquit* *περὶ ἀνωμαλίας*<\* (some numerals omitted) *libros*> *iei*<*s*> (ms. *lei*) *libris etc.* Ductus τ/ι: *eide*<*m*> for *et de*.

2. Insertion; paragraph number moved: *et ex hac* <*consuetudo* (end of Par. 2).> *consuetudo etc.*

4. Ductus, s/d: quae <se> (ms. quod) <d>erigunt. Cf. Lindsay, Introd. p. 88 (Uncial s/d). Insertion: finis, <interest> utrum . . . analogia an usus [an] etc.

6. Compendia; dittography; a/re: for ubi ~~†~~oporteret redigeretur dici etc. read ubi oporteat redigere tibi dici id in populum aliter ac L inde omnibus dici, corruption of a marginal gloss on *dici in populum*, viz: *id est de omnibus dici* in eum qui sit in populo. For *redigere (tibi)* = to conclude for yourself cf. *animum redigere* in Accius ap. Non. 174, 12: ut credam . . . argumenta *redigunt animum* et commovent.

10. Brachylogy: *perperam* <declinatum> *receptum* est. The insertion correctly interprets the text but there may have been a brachylogy in the original text.

20. Brachylogy: the subject of *traducit* is *ratio* but it is hardly to be inserted just before it.

24. Insertions: *septemtrionali circo et* (ms. *circumit*) cum h<inc e>is etc.

26. Copyist mistook case: *alii* (ms. *alios*) *motus* sic item cum habeant *alios* etc.

30. Delete † before *orationem* (cognate object of *loquimur*).

33. Insertion, after GS. (with change of order): <po>-puli minus <usu> trita.

34. Ductus, s/n (in very early minuscule; according to Lindsay, Introd. s. c., p. 87, n/r and s/r are interchanged): ut ex satis nascuntur lentis.

40. Ductus, b/d; compendium: in *rebus similis* (ms. *re dissimilis*) *figurae formas* [indissimiles] *imponim<us>* (ms. *nunt*) *dispariles* etc.

46. Lacuna supplied: *quod dicunt nos dissimilitudinem* <sequi>; itaque etc.

49. Text defended: *percubuit* is intelligible, though the sentence is complicated.

53. Insertion: in hoc <non> tollunt.

54. Haplography: *casus* <tan>tum [cum] commutantur etc.

55. Confused endings: ut Terenti<ei>[um] et Terentium et Terentiam etc. Dittography: [Iovem] Iovem et Iovam. Change of 1st *Iovem* to *non* not necessary, as the *non* before *itidem* would have carried through.



58. Compendia of short words omitted: omnia <non> habent <quod>.

59. Emend after GS., changing order: quendam societatem, <nullam> neutra cum his etc.

65. Old spelling confused: [†] ut utrei (ms. utre ·I·).

66. Confusion of like words: argent[e]um: nam id tum cum non (ms. iam) vas: argent<e>um enim, si pocillum. Here the collective *argentum* 'plate' (or "the silver") is recognized.

67. Lacuna supplied: quae ipsa dicuntur nunc melius <vina. item> unguenta etc.

68. Insertion: balneum nomen <graecum est> et graecum introiit in urbem, publice<que> ibi consedit.

71. Interpretation: sedne (not *sed ne*) is interrogative= but what of—unless *nē=ne quidem*. Punctuation: Aquilius <.> [†] Faustius<:> Faustio (dative) would construe better. Or read Faustius <(si) dicerent> recte dicerent Faustianos etc.

73. Interpretation: ut enim dies non potest esse magis (sc. dies, cf. on tam vii, 30) quam mane. *magis aedilis* is cited from Cicero.

77. Ms. defended: in nihil (construe like *in rem, in usum*), not [in]nihil<i>. Adverb with noun: tam casus, cf. on §73.

79. Endings confused (? compendium): sic et Alexandri membrorum simulacro (ms. °um) etc.

80. Insertion, after Spengel: sed <manus; nec> consuetudo etc.

81. Similar words confused: hi tresses ut (ms. et).

86. Numeral sign confused; ductus, b/d: for et ·V· read et X; —ad octonaria (ms. ab).

88. Lacuna questioned: a brachylogy will account for the text, but neque eo minus, <ut> in altero quod est mille, praeponeamus is a possible correction.

89. Definition: quoniam in eo, on *in eo*= 'besides' see V, 152; cf. on cum hoc vi. 52. Haplography: graec<e> graec> an<i>c[a]eve (ms. °ne) hoc Argos. Cf. X. 71, alia graeca alia graecanica. Insertion (concinntatis causa): latine <hi> Argi.

92. Definition: innatione[s] ex procreante=by 'innateness' on the sire's side.

94. Ending omitted: sic casuum aliquem assumi<mus>, ut etc. Or indefinite 3d plur. assumunt may stand, but see viii, 10; ix, 40.

95. Ductus, b/n (cf. vii, 8): de[c]libatum. Syntax: omnia . . . ad respondendum. Accusative governed by neuter gerundive common in Varro, r. r., and found from Plautus. Cf. also §111, omnis repudiandum erit artis. But here omnib<us> might stand, were not omnia a cognate object.

101. Ductus B/R; compendium: infecta <tempo>ra, not <ver>ba with GS.

102. Old form: in suo qui[s]que genere. See on vii, 88. Definition: externi<s>, in general=ceteris, but refers to the arrangement of the cases in horizontal order, nom. gen. dat. etc.

103. Insertion; t/c: item sit <si>.

111. Lacuna supplied, after Popma: utrumque <falsum est>. Objection of GS. not valid, as *falsum* = mistaken. Insertions: reprehendendus <si> qui debet in scribendo [non] vidisse verum <non vidit>, non ideo etc.

113. Short word (compendium) omitted: quod alia inter se aliâ <sorte, or arte> sunt. For <sorte> cf. Horatian non tuae sortis iuvenem. Why not *his* instead of [h]is? Old form: haec †nerene. *haec* is n. pl. fem. The old correction to *maenae* seems better than to read the hapax *neren* <a>e.

114. Transposition, o/e: quandoque (ms. quo quando) = quasi semper. Definition: Here for almost the first time Varro's *analogiae* (*analogia*) admits of intelligible translation by 'analogy'. Elsewhere, save in a few cases in book X, it signifies 'regularity'. This is because in our generation 'analogy' has crystallized in grammatical terminology as 'the means of explaining its ancient counterterm "anomaly"'.

#### BOOK X.

5. Punctuation: animadvertendas <:> (not .).

15. Insertion: a nomine <alio> aliae (unless aliei) <rei>.

16. Punctuation dicere <;> (not .) itaque etc.

19. Confusion in case: in vocibus [ac] similitudo (not °inibus).

20. Inconcinnity: [†] vocabulis: this may be a Varronian slip for *nominatibus*.

18 (20). Lacuna: in nominatus [† 's'] <\*\*\*\*>. Is 's' for marginal d<eest>? On s/d in uncials see IX. 4.

21. Insertion: ut non solum <alter>utrumque sit virile—unless *utrumque* be taken in the sense of *alterutrumque*.

25. Ductus, s/r: curro (ms. curso) cursito. For a translator this change makes the example more available, but Varro may have written curso.

32. General syntax: In this section Varro clearly presents the impersonality of the passive.

34. Lacuna supplied: sunt hoc ge<nere, quod> quemadmodum declinamus (? or declinemus ?), etc.

41. Delete †; syntax: in [†] similibus sic etc.; sic est ad unum victoriatum denarius, sic ad alterum victoriatum alter denarius. The correlative *sic's* may be archaic like the correlative *dum's* in VI. 91. Accordingly read, later in the section, cum <sic> est filius ad patrem sic [si] est filia ad matrem. Could the inserted <sic> be reflected in the excised [si]? It must be remembered that, by an *apriori*, *si* 'if' originated from the first of a pair of *si(c)*'s, as *dum* 'while' from the last of a pair of *dum's*.

44. Inconcinnity: ex illa[†] vicenaria [atria quae scilicet] centenaria formula etc. is not concinnate. We secure concinnity by writing *denaria centenaria* or *vicenaria <du>centenaria*, though why, in the latter instance, the proportions should be designated by their mean term it is hard to divine.

48. Ductus, c/r (V. 111); insertion: ratus (ms. *c°*) sum verberatus sum <rebor> verberabor, iniuria comprehendunt (ms. *re°*). End; delete †: [†] reprehendunt. Pregnant meaning='ask by way of criticism, object'.

50. Confluent word: *recticasuum*=gen. pl. of *rectus casus*.

56. Deletion: potius [quom] ab incorrupto principio, ab natura rerum quam ab libidine hominum. Inconcinnity: verborum forma<s> facilius <ex multitudinis> singularia<s> videri posse. Varro's reason for saying *singularias* instead of *singulares* is not evident.

61. Ductus, P/T: non [m]<c>ulpae in consuetudine occurrent. For general (agricultural) use of *culpa* as 'fault, mistake' cf. Thes. IV, 1298. 16 sq.

64. Insertion (transposition): partim quae pertineant. <ut> non pertinent [ut] ea etc.

64-65. Punctuation: sed nulla harum fit loquendo<.> pars ad orationem[.] quae pertinent (? or sg.) <:> (not ,).

66. Punctuation, excision: significant quicquam <,> (not :) id[eo] quod . . ut a merula merulae (sc. significant): sunt <enim> eius modi etc.

67. Construct form incorrectly transmitted: cum dicimus biga[e] una[e].

70. Insertion: [de] <hoc> genere multi utuntur . . plerique <alii>. haec etc.

72. Delete †; ductus, s/e: [†] inferendo . . . [†]ad has duplicis quas (ms. *quae*) . . est simili <ad> analogias.

80. Compendium incorrectly expanded: no<me>n, not non. Cf. no[me]n in V. 26; IX. 23.

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

## II.—STUDIES IN THE SYNTAX OF EARLY LATIN.

In 1910 Professor Charles E. Bennett laid all students of Latin, not merely of early Latin, but of Latin in its historical development, under heavy obligations by his *Syntax of Early Latin*. Vol. I—The Verb.<sup>1</sup> The debt such students owe to him has been greatly enlarged by the publication, in May last, of *The Syntax of Early Latin*. Vol. II—The Cases.<sup>2</sup>

In these volumes, as attractive in appearance as they are impressive in contents, the aim of Professor Bennett is to replace the antiquated Holtze, *Syntaxis Priscorum Scriptorum Latinorum*. In the Preface to Volume I he defined "Early Latin" as the Latin from the beginnings to 100 B. C. In that volume he cited the fragments of the dramatists by Ribbeck's edition (undated), those of the orators by the edition of Meyer-Dübner (1837). There was nothing in the Preface to indicate whose text he had followed in his citations from Lucilius, though an examination of the citations themselves proved that they had been made from some edition earlier (and less good, on the whole) than that of Marx (Volume 1, *Prolegomena and Text*, 1904; Volume 2, *Commentary*, 1905). In Volume I, again, he professed to give, in the main, the complete collection of material for each of the usages considered. He noted also that, for the most part, there were no adequate monographs on the verb on which to rely, so that for the larger part of that volume he had been obliged to make independent collections.

One turns naturally, first of all, to the Preface of the volume now under review. There is nothing to indicate that the author gave heed to the suggestion made in A. J. P. XXXII 333, that, since Lucretius belonged in spirit to a time much anterior to that in which he lived in the flesh, it would be well

<sup>1</sup> For American reviews of this volume see Hale, *Classical Philology* 6. 367-375; Knapp, A. J. P. XXXII 333-343; Wheeler, *The Classical Weekly* 5. 6-7, 12-15.

<sup>2</sup> Published by Allyn & Bacon, Boston. Pages x + 409. \$4.



worth while, in a study of the Syntax of Early Latin, to take account of Lucretius's syntax, as showing that tendency to archaism which marks so much of Lucretius's language.<sup>1</sup> Still, as Professor Bennett notes in the Preface to Volume I, a "definite <lower> date <for early Latin> is really impossible, since archaic Latin does not terminate abruptly, but continues even down to imperial times". In so far as this sentence implies, or seems to imply, that archaic Latin ever ceased, it is a bit misleading; in any case, the expression "continues even down to imperial times" is too vague to be of use. See the discussion of archaism in the times of Aulus Gellius, and its antecedents, in my paper *Archaism in Aulus Gellius*, printed in *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler* (New York, 1894), especially pages 126-141.<sup>2</sup>

I note with interest that, in the present volume, Professor Bennett at times cites Gellius, partly for his own usage, as illustrative of that of early Latin, partly for the light he throws, by his comments, on early Latin. This might with profit have been done oftener. See, e. g., below, pages 279-280.

Nor has Professor Bennett adopted in the present volume the suggestion made in A. J. P. XXXII 333, that a list of all the works and articles cited in a volume of his work should be given at the beginning or at the close of the volume. The gain to the reader in the facility with which he could determine whether a given work or article had been employed is

<sup>1</sup> See e. g. Munro's *Lucretius*,<sup>4</sup> 2. 15-17; Merrill's *Lucretius*, 45-46; Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*, 298; Giussani's edition of *Lucretius*, I. xxv.

<sup>2</sup> See also M. Dorothy Brock, *Studies in Fronto and his Age*, 25-35, 181-182 (Cambridge, 1911); Purser, *The Story of Cupid and Psyche as Related by Apuleius*, xciii-xciv (London, 1910). Both these writers combat current views concerning the language of Fronto and Apuleius. See in answer to them, W. E. Foster, *Studies in Archaism in Aulus Gellius*, 3-29, especially 10-14 (New York, 1912: Columbia University Dissertation). Some conception of the amount of archaism in Apuleius may be obtained by noting the frequency of citations from Apuleius in the lists in my paper in the Drisler book, 141-171, giving archaisms of form and vocabulary in Aulus Gellius, and the frequency of such citations in Dr. Foster's work, *passim*, but especially in the lists on pages 29-64. See also Cooper, *Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius*, *passim*, but especially the Introduction, xv-xlvi (New York, 1895).

self-evident; it seems equally evident that such gain would be ample compensation to the author for the labor involved in making such a list and to the publisher for the expense in setting it up. Further, in such a list it would be possible to give exactly, once for all, the place of publication and the date of each book or article. In the footnotes to the present volume, as in those to its predecessor, the dates of books and articles cited are sometimes given, sometimes not. In footnote 1 to page 1 Dräger, *Historische Syntax*, volume 1 (edition not named), and Kühner-Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, volume 2, are cited side by side with no hint of the long interval of time between the second edition of Dräger (1878-1881) and the second edition of Kühner (1912). It would have been possible, too, in a general bibliography to give the titles of volumes with great particularity, and then in the body of the book to save space by employing consistently the same abbreviations, all carefully noted in the bibliographical list. On page 1, and often elsewhere, as matters stand now, we have such references as "Kühner-Stegmann, . . . ii, p. 243 ff.", which will cause many a moment of annoyance now that the *Zweiter Teil* of this volume of Stegmann's revision of Kühner has been published (1914). This part too is pagged from 1 upwards.

One suggestion, however, made in A. J. P. XXXII 333, Professor Bennett has taken to heart in the present volume. Ennius he now cites uniformly by the text of Vahlen (2d ed., 1903; A. J. P. XXXII 1-35), giving parallel references for the dramatic fragments to Ribbeck (3d ed., I take it: of the tragic fragments, 1897, of the comic fragments, 1898). Lucilius he cites now from Marx, the fragments of the Orators from Meyer (1842), a book unfortunately out of print and hard to obtain. Even more, apparently, than in the preceding volume Professor Bennett was obliged to rely on his own collections, a fact which led, no doubt, to the long interval between the volumes.

One statement in the Preface to Volume II merits special attention: "Yet I have nowhere bound myself to the text of any editor. It has seemed necessary to call attention to this, since some readers have assumed that in citing by the page or verse of a special editor I have committed myself to his text.

It ought to be superfluous to say that such is not the case and that I have deviated in hundreds of instances from the readings of the special editions to which I have referred. I only hope that my own readings may seem in the main sound and justified". Let us echo the hope. Let us hope also that, throughout, in deviating from his guides (and, perhaps, too, from the manuscripts) in these hundreds of instances he kept in mind the warnings that have more than once been uttered with respect to the risks attendant on emendation of fragments: see, e. g., A. J. P. XXVII 77, XXIX 478, XXXII 26, 35, and, more especially, Lindsay, Nonius Marcellus I. XXXVIII-XXXIX.<sup>1</sup> I note with much concern that Professor Bennett has provided no means whereby his readers may determine these hundreds of instances in which he has departed from the readings of his special editors. The student of syntax needs to know always on what foundations the combinations of his guides rest. Besides leaving his readers uncertain on this all-important point, unless they examine for themselves in every instance his quotations, by comparison with the special texts and the manuscripts both, Professor Bennett lays himself open to the very charge which in the Preface to our volume he brings against the treatises of others on which he had hoped to rely. These were of little help, he says, in part because their collections were incomplete, in part because they were "based, in great measure, on conjectural readings of the past generation".

The book before us is divided into seven chapters, as follows: I. Case Names, Case Theories, Nominative, Predicate Nouns, Appositives (1-7); II. The Genitive (8-100); III. The Dative (101-190); IV. The Accusative (191-263); V. The Vocative (264-278); VI. The Ablative (279-385); VII. The Locative (386-390). The Index covers pages 391-409 (about 37 full columns).

<sup>1</sup>Lindsay, discussing *De Ratione Emendandi Noni*, reminds us that Nonius repeatedly cites "*Vergilii versus integer, manca sententia*"; if he remembers this fact, the editor of Nonius "<non> nimis indulgebis prurigini emendandi". We need not go to the professional grammarian or scholar to see this habit of citing incomplete sentences or phrases: compare Suetonius Claudius 42, *Cuidam barbaro Graece ac Latine disserenti "Cum utroque" inquit "sermone nostro sis paratus", et in commendanda patribus conscriptis Achaia, etc.*

What is a reviewer to do with such a book as this, so crowded with riches? It is a big book, in more than one sense of the word. It required courage of a high order to essay the task involved in this work; to pursue it as long as Professor Bennett has pursued it demands unusual patience and extraordinary powers of application. To accomplish so much as he has already achieved is not merely to demonstrate convincingly one's own capacity for scientific work, but at the same time to do something, a good deal, to remove the reproach so often heaped on American scholarship, that it confines itself to small tasks, demanding no great concentration and no long persistent labor. Let us hope that Professor Bennett will be spared to complete the work, nay, more, to see all the volumes through a revised edition.

To deal in detail with the hundreds of rubrics in this volume, all bound together, to be sure, by certain ties, yet after all separate, involving hosts of matters still *sub iudice* and in large measure subjective, and so affording at every turn opportunity for discussion, is manifestly impossible. It remains, then, to pick out a part of the book (Chapters I-II: pages 1-100), to indicate how Professor Bennett handles the problems involved in that, to sum up what he has said on them and thereby to give a hint of the results of his investigations, to add to his discussions, wherever possible, through commendation, criticism, or citation of new material. At another time I hope to deal with other parts of the volume. If, in the present article, I shall happen to differ from Professor Bennett more often than I agree, let no one fancy me insensible of the greatness of his task, of the fine way in which he has discharged it, and of the substantial contributions he has made to the study of early Latin syntax. No student of Latin syntax, for any period, early or late, will disregard Professor Bennett's collections of materials. Every editor and student of Plautus, for instance, will have Bennett's volumes as his *Vade Mecum*, a κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί. In using the general manuals of Latin syntax, the scholar will at every turn check up their statements by an examination of Professor Bennett's volumes. In view of all this, the fact that a given reviewer questions views in fields subjective or would have arranged the material in a different way is a minor matter. The great matter, the

matter *per quam de nobis omnibus optime meruit*, is that Professor Bennett has put together, as no one else has done, here or abroad, the materials which we may arrange or rearrange as we will, in the effort to learn from them even more than Professor Bennett felt himself, in 400 pages, able to essay to convey.

The discussion of the origin of the Latin case names (1-2) is too brief, at least in the explanation of the terms *αἰτιατική* (*πτῶσις*) and *accusativus* (*casus*). Professor Bennett says merely (2) "In calling the accusative *αἰτιατική*, the Greeks intended to designate this case as the 'case of effect', i. e. of the thing caused (from *αἰτία*)", and that by the Romans "*Αἰτιατική* was falsely rendered by the name *accusativus*, as though *αἰτιατική* were derived from *αἰτιάομαι*, 'accuse'". Two things here will give pause to many. First, the phrase 'accusative of effect', used by Professor Bennett in his Latin Grammar and his *The Latin Language*, admirable though it is, is not at all familiar to many students of Latin: this every one knows who has used it in the presence of a class of teachers of Latin. Secondly, not in his own recollections of the word *αἰτία*, nor in Liddell and Scott nor yet in Crönert's revision of Passow's *Wörterbuch der Griechischen Sprache* (1913) will the reader find evidence that *αἰτία* = 'effect'; the lexicons give but one sense, 'cause'! I get far more light by looking up the article Accusative in the Century Dictionary and Cyclopaedia. There we learn to get at the sense of *αἰτιατική* (*πτῶσις*) via *αἰτιατός*, 'effected'. This word Crönert handles well enough; Liddell and Scott, however, made it still harder to interpret *αἰτία* as 'the thing caused or effected' by writing, s. v. *αἰτιατός*, "produced by a cause, effected . . .; τὸ *αἰτιατόν* the effect, opp. to τὸ *αἴτιον* the cause". One wonders, lastly, how the Romans could have thought of the accusative case as the case of blaming. In their designations of the other cases one can see some plausibility: here there seems no gleam of sense.

On page 1 *πτῶσις* is defined as 'deviation' or 'change', and the oblique cases are described as 'deviations' from the nominative. If 'fall' had been the word chosen to represent *πτῶσις*, *casus* would be more evidently a natural rendering of *πτῶσις*.

On pages 2-3 the author declares briefly that most scholars



make the ablative, the locative, the instrumental and the dative local in origin—if they admit at all that inflected forms in the parent speech had a 'Grundbegriff'. He thinks it probable that the genitive too was local in origin. Further discussion of this point is to be found at the beginnings of the several chapters. Discussions of origins occur often, also, under the individual rubrics within the chapters. See below, 276–277, 290, 291, 292.

On page 5, after a few instances of a predicate noun in the dative and the ablative have been cited, we have a list of the more unusual verbs 'taking' the predicate nominative construction, such as *adsum*, *clueo*, *consequor*, *eo*, *ineo*, *venio*, etc. In connection with Am. 635 *voluptatem ut maeror comes consequatur*, the word *comes* made me think of Professor Fay's paper, *The Thesaurus Linguae Latinae: Comes* It, in *The Classical Journal* 8. 253–256 (March, 1913). Professor Fay relied wholly on the *Thesaurus*: yet he cites, to prove that the locution *comes* it is early, Plautus Am. 929 *iuben mi ire comites?* This is an interesting example, since the subject of *ire* is *meas res* (see 928). This example Professor Bennett<sup>1</sup> does not give, a fact which raises at once, thus early in the book, the question of the completeness of his collections. One example of *vivo* with predicate nominative is cited by Professor Bennett: Am. 75 *dixit vos victores vivere*. In this connection we can now cite Professor Meader's valuable paper, *The Development of Copulativ Verbs in the Indo-European Languages*, T. A. P. A. xliii (for 1912: issued in 1913), 173–200, especially 189–190. For verbs meaning 'go' or 'walk' as copulas compare *ibidem* 186–187. There Professor Meader cites Plautus Aul. 721 (not given by Bennett): *Male perditus pessume ornatus eo*. I find in Bennett no discussion or explanation of the predicate noun with *clueo*. Many would welcome such discussion, here and elsewhere. But lack of space, I suppose, was the barrier.

In the discussion of appositives (5–7), the position of the appositive, the point to which Norden, in his edition of *Aeneid*

<sup>1</sup> In his Preface Professor Bennett states that, owing to the time required to put this volume through the press, he could not utilize material appearing after the early autumn of 1913.

VI (page 116: note on 7 ff.) gave so much attention, is not considered. What Kiessling on Horace C. 1. 1. 6 called "vorausgenommene Apposition" Norden counts a "Künstlichkeit" of the "neoterische Poesie"; it is rare, he continues, in Horace and Vergil, common in Propertius and Ovid. Under § 1 of Bennett's discussion we find cited, as familiar examples of appositives with a proper name, *Archilinem opstetricem, erilis noster filius Strabax, tonstricem Suram*, which show both possible word-orders. The "vorausgenommene Apposition" thus appears very early.<sup>1</sup> So, in § 3, where Bennett gives examples of nouns like *servos* and *amator* or quasi-nouns like *adulescens* and *adulescentula* in apposition with nouns, both word-orders occur. A paragraph (6) is devoted to the combination *plerique omnes*: three instances occur in Plautus, one in Terence. Of its origin nothing is said. It occurs in Gellius 1. 3. 2; 1. 7. 4; 1. 21. 1; 4. 17. 4; 17. 5. 4; 14. 3. 1 (*pleraque omnia*); 15. 7. 1 *plerisque omnibus*. In 8. 12, a chapter now lost, Gellius discussed *quid significet in veterum libris scriptum plerique omnes*.<sup>2</sup> The phrase strikes me as illogically ordered. I should expect *omnes plerique*, that is, a universal affirmative followed by restricting *plerique*.<sup>3</sup> Through the elision, however, the phrase *plerique omnes* be-

<sup>1</sup> Frobenius, *Die Syntax des Ennius*, § 226 (Nördlingen, 1910), declares that no sure rule can be given for the position of the appositive-substantive in Ennius. Often it precedes. "Doch erscheint soviel klar, dass der betonte Begriff immer voraufgeht". He adds that "örtliche Bezeichnungen wie *oppidum . . . urbs . . . mons* <gingen> immer voraus". Patronymics, too, precede the *nomen proprium*, "wenn sie schon an und für sich oder im Zusammenhange so bekannt sind, dass sie für dieses eintreten können . . .".

<sup>2</sup> *Plerique omnes* occurs in Fronto 183 (Naber), *plerique omnes qui eam curaverant frustra fuerunt*. Here *frustra fuerunt* gives us a second archaism in seven words.

<sup>3</sup> For an unilluminating comment on the phrase see Dziatzko-Hauler<sup>4</sup> on Phormio 172 (1913). In his *Lateinische und Romanische Comparation* 41 (1879), Wölfflin wrote: "Nehmen wir die alliterierende Verbindung *sex septem . . .* zur Richtschnur, so hätten wir ein disjunctives Asyndeton = *plurimi vel omnes*, und der vorwiegend archaische Gebrauch unserer Formel würde gut dazu stimmen". This view has found many supporters: see e. g. Reisig-Haase, *Vorlesungen*, etc. (new ed., 1888), 3. 832, and Anm. 610 a on page 833. If the ellipsis is possible this explanation makes the phrase very effective.

comes metrically convenient. In working out the articles *et* and *que* for Professor Lodge's *Lexicon Plautinum* I seemed to find evidence that the choice between *et* and *que* was to some extent at least determined by metrical considerations. However, such a combination as Cap. 232 *maxima pars morem hunc homines habent*, is parallel to *plerique omnes*, in that a restrictive phrase precedes the universal *homines*. See further footnote 3 on page 275.

In Chapter II we have first a discussion of the Original Force of the Genitive (8-10), then, in succession, a discussion of the Genitive with Nouns (10-81), the Genitive with Adjectives and Participles (82-87), the Genitive with Verbs (88-100), and, finally, the Genitive of Exclamation (100: only two examples occur, both in Plautus). Of the Genitive with Nouns we have nine main subdivisions; one of these, the Genitive of the Whole, has itself thirteen subdivisions. Of the Genitive with Verbs there are nine subdivisions. This is typical of the book. The material falls easily into large classes, which correspond closely in scope and names to the classifications and nomenclature commonly current.

On page 8 Professor Bennett surrenders the view set forth in his *The Latin Language*, 194 (1907), and in *Schmalz, Syntax und Stilistik*<sup>4</sup> (1910), that in Latin the genitive was primarily an adnominal case. His reason is that "the testimony of the Indo-European languages is clear that the genitive was freely construed with verbs even in the *Ursprache*". He adds that in Latin "certain genitive formations,—those in *-i*—seem to have been used originally with verbs alone; see below, page 93". On page 93 there is no reference back to page 9; but the reference on page 9 is, I take it, to what, on page 93, Professor Bennett, following Wackernagel, calls "The Type *floci facere*. Value. Price" (discussed pages 93-98). After discussing very briefly (8-9) the value of the three genitive formations (in *-es, -os, -s*; of *o*-stems, in *sio, -so*; of *o*-stems in *-i*), Professor Bennett declares that we can not determine any single value to be attached to the genitive in Indo-European (yet on page 3 he had said that it seemed probable that the genitive was of local origin). The adnominal and the adverbial uses of the genitive, he holds, were originally different. "There was no 'einheitlicher' genitive

in the *Ursprache*". He mentions, though without definitely approving it, Wackernagel's theory that, in the *Ursprache*, the adnominal use had a very limited range, and that at the outset the use with verbs was predominant, if not actually exclusive (10). To the question that naturally springs to the mind, How then did this originally predominant use come to play so small a part in Latin? Professor Bennett gives no attention. He does, however, illustrate more concretely, more fully than anyone has done before, the large part played by the adverbial genitive in Early Latin. Assuming the correctness of Wackernagel's theory, we may note that Latin gave up, in large part, various other usages that had Indo-European sanction, e. g. the infinitive with purpose, the infinitive with adjectives, and the power to make compounds at will.<sup>1</sup>

For the genitive with nouns Bennett can find no one primitive usage. He is content (11) to find in this genitive the "capacity of completing the meaning of the substantive in any one of a great variety of ways suggested by the context". He rightly remarks that it is better frankly to recognize that certain genitive expressions do not fall readily into clearly defined categories; something of the variety and flexibility of the early days long remained, "many uses lying quite outside the clearly marked formal categories, others hovering between two related groups. This principle applies not only to the genitive and other cases, but to the moods and tenses as well. To ignore it is to reverse the order of syntactical development and to represent as primitive what was a matter of growth" (11-12). The principle applies as well to classification for lexicographical purposes, as I learned even better than I had known it before in my article on *Etiam* for Lodge's *Lexicon Plautinum* and in my Notes on *Etiam* in Plautus in *T. A. P. A.* xli, 115-137. To the point Professor Bennett recurs in 37-38, 70, without reference back to 11-12.

The Genitive of Material is defined (12) as denoting "primarily the concrete substance of which anything is composed, or, in the case of collective nouns, the units of which the mass

<sup>1</sup> A bit of syntactical history extremely curious, if Professor Bennett's theories are correct, is that of the case-constructions with verbs of remembering. See below, p. 289, under (2).

consists". The usage is relatively infrequent, he remarks, because the relationship expressed by the genitive here is commonly set forth by adjectives, *faginus*, *aureus*, etc. He admits the difficulty of classification (12, 14), especially of differentiating the Genitive of Material and the Genitive of Quantity. Instances like *multitudo tuorum*, *natio hominum*, *gregem venalium* Gildersleeve-Lodge, 368, would class, I am sure, as genitives of quantity. Into the correctness of our author's assignment of individual examples, however, it will be impossible to go. I note that most of Bennett's examples of the Genitive of Material come from Cato, De Agri Cultura.

The Genitive of the <Parted> Whole is common in Early Latin. The first rubric here is Genitive of Quantity or Measure. "This denotes that of which a certain definite weight or measure is taken". The carefulness of this definition emphasizes the inaccuracy of the designation of this genitive as Genitive of Quantity (Professor Bennett is at one here, however, with others in his use of the term). In such expressions as *argenti nummus*, *cum auri CC nummis Philippis* the measure or quantity is in the noun on which the genitive depends not in the genitive. If we are to be exact enough to speak of the "Genitiv des getheilten Ganzen" (13), if we are to deplore divergences of designation and the lack of precise definitions (12), we should call this subdivision the Genitive of the Quantity Measured, or the like. In spite of Professor Bennett's care in defining, here and elsewhere, there is a frequent looseness in the rubrics, which should find no place in a book of this kind. Thus, to take but one example, the second rubric under Genitive of the Whole is "Neuter Adjectives of Amount" (16). Of course the author has in mind here, as he says at once, examples of the Genitive of the Whole with neuter adjectives of amount; he could easily have arranged the letterpress before the rubric and the rubric itself to make this plain.

Some of the genitives with neuter adjectives of amount (16-19) are interesting. Thus we have an isolated example of *amplius* with the genitive, Cis. 777 *liberorum . . . amplius*, a combination natural enough, however, in view of *minus* and *plus* with the genitive. We have two examples, both from Cato, of *multum* with the genitive, two of *pauzellulum* (one



from Naevius, one from Terence), two of *minimum* (Cato), one of *pauillum* (Lucilius), one of *plurimum* (Cato), three each of *quantillum* and *tantillum* (Plautus), three of *tantumdem* (Plautus, Terence, Cato), besides the common types, *dimidium*, *minus*, *paulum*, *plus*, etc. In the discussion of the Genitive of the Whole with pronouns and pronominal adjectives (20), we find that such a genitive with a relative pronoun occurs only in Cato and in C. I. L. (four examples from Cato, eleven from C. I. L. i. 198-200). *Numquis, nescioquis, ecquis, quivis, alteruter, neuter, uter, ullus, utervis* occur but once each with the genitive (20-22).<sup>1</sup>

On pages 22-23 Professor Bennett states that *mille* is a noun everywhere in Early Latin, except Ba. 928 *mille*<sup>2</sup> *cum numero navium*, and Ba. 230, where the MSS give *mille et ducentos Philippus*. The former passage he interprets by "with the number of a thousand ships". Since he is willing to make *mille* an adjective here, why should he emend Ba. 230 to *mille ac ducentos Philippum* (Bentley), even though in Ba. 272 the MSS give the latter form? This is to ignore at once Plautus's love of variety in his expressions and the principle of the *lectio difficilior*, which, in view both of the preponderance, on Bennett's view, of *mille* as noun and the reading in 272, decidedly applies. The emendation, finally, introduces a very rare use of the genitive (see next paragraph).

A reference to Gellius i. 16 would have been very helpful here. There Gellius, starting with the phrase *ibi mille hominum occiditur* (Quadrigrarius), defends this locution as *ratione certa ac proba grammaticae disciplinae dicta*. He cites examples from Quadrigrarius, Lucilius, Varro, Cato, Cicero

<sup>1</sup> Here, as in many another place in Professor Bennett's book, the facts adduced form a vigorous warning against 'emending' any passage of Early Latin because, as delivered to us by our MSS, it shows an isolated usage. Syntactical ἀναξ ἐλπημένα need not trouble us, for this period at least.

<sup>2</sup> So Leo and the Teubner text, but not Lindsay, whose text Bennett professes to follow; Lindsay reads *milli*, which suits the meter (iambic octonarius) better than *mille*. Lindsay must regard *milli* as a noun in the ablative, and take *numero* as in *saepe numero*, or as *pondo* is taken in such a phrase as Men. 526 *addas auri pondo unciam*. With Bennett's view of the passage compare Valerius Maximus, page 13, Excerpt 6 (Kempf): *Persae mille navium numero Delum compulsi . . .*

(Phil. 6. 15), and insists that in Pro Milone 53 Cicero wrote *hominum mille*<sup>1</sup> *versabatur valentum*. The example from Varro given by Gellius is from XVII Humanarum (XVIII, fr. 2, MI, says Hosius, 1903) and runs: *Ad Romuli initium plus mille et centum annorum est*. This must be added, then, to Ba. 230 (an example got by emendation: see above), 272, and Lucilius 1053 *argenti* (*argentis* codd) *sescentum ac mille*, which Bennett says (23) are "the only <passages> in Early Latin where we find the Genitive of the Whole with *mille* combined with one of the hundreds". A reference to Gellius, the professional archaist, as we may call him, thus lights up our studies both directly and indirectly, directly by reminding us of ancient treatment of the phenomena under consideration, indirectly by supplying us at once a fourth example of a rare usage.

On page 32 in such expressions as Ba. 415 *quid hoc negotist*? Bennett joins the genitive with the demonstrative, on the basis of sense and the position of the genitive. Why not use in further support of this view Eu. 544 *nunc mi hoc negoti dedere*, M. G. 956 *hoc negoti mandatumst mihi*, Tri. 578 *dic hoc negoti quomodo actumst*, cited also in this very paragraph? Here the genitive must belong with the demonstrative.

On page 34 four examples are given from the Annales of Ennius of the type *dia dearum*. This Bennett calls a Grecism (yet in the Index the caption Grecism does not occur). Frobenius, Die Syntax des Ennius, 35, declares that this usage is confined to epic poetry, and is an imitation of familiar Homeric expressions. Finding Grecisms in Early Latin is interesting in view of the vigorous warning given by Leo, Plautinische Forschungen<sup>2</sup>, 102-103, against "die Jagd nach Gräcismen in der Syntax". This hunt, he says, has usually been fruitless: the supposed Grecisms have turned out to be good Italic constructions.<sup>2</sup> If we are to admit Grecisms in

<sup>1</sup> Reid ad loc. says this, not *mille homines*, is regular in Cicero. See *mille* in Krebs-Schmalz, *Antibarbarus*<sup>1</sup> (1907), and Schmalz again, in Reisig-Haase, *Vorlesungen*, Anm. 335.

<sup>2</sup> In his note on Most. 912, *di immortales, mercimoni lepidi*, which is cited by Professor Bennett, page 100, as one of the two examples of the Genitive of Exclamation, Sonnenschein (2d ed., 1907) sees a Grecism, though he can find but two parallels, one from Propertius, one

Ennius (as we must in the case just discussed), why have editors been so unwilling to see another in Ennius Ann. 201-202 (if they persist in reading *viai*)?

Quo vobis mentes, rectae quae stare solebant  
antehac, dementis sese flexere *viai*?

Here the editors of Cicero Cato Maior 16, where this passage is cited (e. g. Reid, Moore), Frobenius, *Die Syntax des Ennius*, 32, Bennett, in our book, page 36, join *viai* with *quo*, in spite of the wide separation of *quo* and *viai*, in spite, too, of the infrequency of *quo* with the genitive (Bennett cites but two other examples, both from Plautus: on these, too, see below), and in spite of the fact that the MSS give not *viai* but *via* (a fact noted by Bennett himself). If *viai* is to be joined with *quo*, then, as Frobenius noted, we must correct the declaration of Schmalz<sup>4</sup>, § 73, that *quo* with the partitive genitive begins with Sallust; we have surer ground, however, for correcting him in Bennett's two examples from Plautus. Here, we may note in passing, will lie one of the great values of Professor Bennett's work—the supplying of proof that many a construction occurs far earlier than our standard general manuals of Latin syntax would have us believe (see the discussion above, pages 274-276, of the place of the appositive). Reverting to our Ennius passage we may note that Frobenius, page 38, § 67, writes: "Häufig steht bei E. der Ausgangspunkt einer Bewegung im blossen Abl., wo später in der Regel Präp. angewendet werden". I venture to think, then, that editors have been too quick to emend the manuscript text in our passage. I note in conclusion that *quo . . . viai*, if taken together, gives a type of the genitive with *quo* quite unlike that in the only two other examples that Bennett is able to quote of *quo* with a genitive; these both involve *quo gentium*. So we have only *gentium* with *quoquo* (twice), *quovis* (twice), and with *usquam* and *nusquam*. With *ubi* we do find *loci*, but this seems to me to involve easier combinations than that seen in *quo . . . flexere viai*.<sup>1</sup>

---

from Lucan. Professor Fay thinks the expression is "either a Greekish genitive of exclamation . . . for which there is very little warrant anywhere in Latin, or a genitive of quality . . . describing *porticus*, which had just been recalled to memory by *longissima*".

<sup>1</sup>I am aware that very often in Latin the first and the last words of a series, even a long series, belong together grammatically. I should

On pages 37-38 Professor Bennett holds that the term Possessive Genitive is too loosely used by most grammarians, as a kind of catch-all for examples which they cannot assign to more clearly defined categories. In his own treatment he aims to "exclude all uses where there did not seem to be a fairly clear possessive idea. This possessive idea is present especially in the following classes of combinations: 1) Where there is some material possession, as *Cratini aedes, anulum gnati tui*; 2) In the designation of ordinary blood relationships, as *filia, filius, uxor, nepos Gai*, etc.; 3) In the designation of mental and moral qualities, as *ineptia huius, quorum crudelitatem*, etc.; 4) In the designation of parts of the body, as *abdomina tunni, pes Gai*; 5) In figurative extensions of these four types of usage". Instances which do not show a real idea of possession, he puts under Free Uses of the Genitive, a much-embracing category (70-80). The examples which he admits into his list of Possessive Genitives he arranges according to the alphabetical order of the governing noun, if I may be allowed to designate in this way the noun on which the genitive depends; the attempt to subdivide the examples into logical categories, made, e. g. by Blomquist, *De Genitivi apud Plautum Usu* (Helsingfors, 1892), he rejects.

like, however, other examples of such wide separation in Ennius. Frobenius, pages 109-126, in a careful discussion of "Wortstellung" in Ennius, has nothing directly bearing on our point. But it is clear enough that wide separation is not the rule in Ennius. In § 227 he notes only four examples of the separation of adverb from adjective. In § 222, which deals with Hyperbaton des Adjektivs (140 examples), we get more help: "In der überwiegenden Zahl der Fälle ist ein Wort dazwischengeschoben, häufig sind es auch zwei d. h. das betreffende Zwischenglied samt Zubehör, seltener drei (etwa zehnmal), nur vereinzelt vier, fünf oder gar sechs Wörter". The example which shows six words between an adjective and its noun, Scaen. 316 *Ego deum genus esse semper dixi et dicam caelitum*, he deems worthy of special discussion (page 117): "Die weite Trennung von *deum*—*caelitum* stört den Zusammenhang durchaus nicht, weil *deum* allein verständlich war und *caelitum* auch als Subst. benützt werden konnte". Plainly, then, the wide separation of *quo* and *viai* in our Ennius passage is against the current interpretation of the syntax here. We should therefore either follow the MSS, and see one of those free uses of the ablative recognized by Frobenius (even though Frobenius cites no exact parallel), or, if we read *viai*, we should join that word with *flexere* and find a Grecism.

For attempts at classification by logical categories, difficult as they are, subjective as they inevitably are in part, I have the strongest prepossession: see my review of Professor Wetmore's *Index Verborum Vergilianus*, in *The Classical Weekly* 6. 101-103, 109-111. As a matter of fact, in assigning his examples to the category under discussion, Professor Bennett was himself obliged to classify largely on logical grounds. If, however, we are to forego division on logical grounds, is Professor Bennett's arrangement by the alphabetical order of the governing nouns justifiable? I think not. Surely, in a study of the Possessive Genitive the thing that counts is the possessor, not the thing possessed. We should admit at once that anything, concrete or abstract, may be possessed. But, we want to know, who or what can possess, by way of the Latin genitive? It is, then, the genitive in these combinations, not the governing noun, that is of real importance. If, then, we arrange the material according to the alphabetical order of the nouns involved, that order should be, I think, the order of the nouns (pronouns) represented by the genitives. At the least there should be a brief reclassification, subsidiary to that given at length by Professor Bennett, according to the order of the possessors. Professor Bennett's scheme is definitely troublesome in various ways. We are studying the genitive: but we find the governing nouns, by whose alphabetical order our genitive material has been disposed, in widely varying cases. Again, we find grammatical kith and kin rudely severed. Thus, *adolescentiae eius*, *eius aetas*, *eius aliquid*, *avo eius*, *eius color*, *eius famam*, *eius libido*, *salute eius*, *superbia eius* are scattered over ten pages! Further, Professor Bennett's arrangement gives a wholly fictitious prominence to some of his nouns. Thus *adulescentia* is cited for but one example. But, when we note that the genitive involved is *eius*, the presence of *adulescentia* in a combination of words involving the idea of possession ceases to have the importance which Professor Bennett's arrangement gives to the word. But, far more important, Professor Bennett's arrangement conceals from his readers, or at least does not readily show them, the one thing they will, I am sure, want to know: In what percentage of instances does the word which stands in the Possessive Genitive denote an actual person? In what per-



centage does it denote something easily capable of personification? Does the word in any case denote a thing incapable of personification? The reader can, to be sure, work through the examples and find these facts for himself; but Professor Bennett, who knows the material far better than any of his readers is likely to know it, could have helped far more than he has. Most of the examples, we find, involve names of persons, or instances of *eius*, *illius*, *huius*, etc. Examples like Naevius Com. 35, *mei feri ingeni acrimonia*, are very rare in Professor Bennett's list; so too are even such examples as Acc. 10, *ventorum animae*, Men. 140, *commoditatis omnis articulos scio*, in which, to a Roman, personification would be easy enough. In the examples of the predicate use of this genitive given on pages 49-50 the genitive always denotes a person. Clearly, then, Professor Bennett has been true to his principles with respect to this genitive, as set forth by him on pages 37-38 (see above, page 282).

On page 50 the subjective genitive is defined by Professor Bennett, as "denoting primarily the person who is the author of some act, or who is in some state or condition". The material is again arranged according to the alphabetical order of the governing nouns. Against this arrangement much the same objections lie as were urged against this order above, in the discussion of the Possessive Genitive. Surely, here too the important thing is the genitive, not the governing noun. In looking over Professor Bennett's material (50-56) from this point of view, we find that only in rare instances does the Subjective Genitive, in his view, fail to denote an actual person; the examples of transfer, by figurative usage, so that things appear in this genitive (50), are few.

Under the Objective Genitive (57-65) the material is again arranged according to the alphabetical order of the governing nouns. In itself, however, this arrangement is not objectionable, since here, in sharp contrast to the situation with respect to the Possessive Genitive and the Subjective Genitive, the more important factor is the governing noun. This observation, in favor of our author, leads to one against him. To determine a very important fact—how far the Objective Genitive is used with nouns that are, so to say, intransitive, that is, with nouns derived from verbs which do not govern the accu-

sative or do not 'take' any case at all or are used with prepositional phrases as their predicate,—one must for himself rearrange Professor Bennett's material, particularly in view of the statement (57) that "the use with nouns related to verbs construed with other cases (as *cursores pelagi*; *fides regni*) is probably just as ancient as with nouns related to transitive verbs; cf. Brugmann, *Grundriss*. ii<sup>2</sup>, p. 605. At times certain nouns not derived from verbs develop a meaning which makes them capable of taking an objective genitive, as: *est quisque faber suae fortunae*". In the great majority of our author's instances the governing noun is directly derived from some transitive verb or readily suggests some transitive verb. It is possible, further, that *faber* (see above) suggested to the Romans *facio*. The following nouns, whose corresponding verbs are not transitive, appear in Professor Bennett's list, with the objective genitive: *concordia*, *confidentia*, *consuetudo*, *cursor* (yet compare Vergil's use of *curro* with the accusative: also *percurro* as transitive would make *cursor* with the genitive easy), *fides*, *fiducia*, *potestas* (yet compare the use of *potio* in Am. 178 *eum potivit servitutis*, discussed by Bennett, 93), *praesidium*, *studium*, *vacuitas*. Some examples of the objective genitive with a noun may be explained by analogy with the genitive with an adjective: cf. e. g. And. 247 *Chremetis adfinitatem*. *Exitium* with the genitive may be due to analogy with *initium* with the genitive, for which see Hec. 351 *initium irae*, And. 709 *narrationis initium*. Less easy to explain is the genitive with *arrabo*, *domina*, *dominus*, *erus*, *moechus*, *permities*, *praeda*, *pretium*, *flagitium*, *imago*, *calamitas*, *copia* (12 instances).

On page 65 Professor Bennett notes that the Genitive of Quality is much less frequent than the Ablative of Quality in Early Latin. "Apart from a few stereotyped formulas, such as *huius modi*, *eius modi*, *parvi preti*, *minumi preti*, etc., the idiom is only scantily represented". The very first example, "*animus*: Men. 269, *homo iracundus animi perdit*", is interesting, to me at least, for two reasons. First, as Professor Bennett notes, elsewhere the genitive, not the ablative, of *animus* is used in qualitative expressions. This phenomenon is matched by the fact that once only is the genitive of *color*, or *genus*, or *ingenium* (this comes by emendation, too, be it

noted<sup>1</sup>) found in expressions of quality (these examples, too, are in Plautus); the ablative of *animus*, *color* and *ingenium* occurs not infrequently in such expressions. Secondly, in Men. 269 *homo iracundus animi perdit*, we have, thus early, both an adjective and a genitive of quality with one noun, a construction which Mr. J. D. Duff, in his note on Juvenal 3. 4-5, <Cumae> *ianua Baiarum est et gratum litus amoeni secessus*, declares to be un-Latin, though the sense clearly is, 'Cumae . . . is a charming stretch of shore, so delightfully sequestered', or, with fuller reference to the word order, 'It's a charming place, on the seashore, delightfully sequestered'.<sup>2</sup>

The inclusion of *bidui* and *tridui*, seen in And. 440, *biduist aut tridui haec sollicitudo*, is justified when we think of the origin of these forms. Professor Bennett compares the use of *dies*, as seen in a solitary example, H. T. 909 *decem dierum vix mihi familia est*. These examples involving *dies* are thus all from Terence. Compare, however, Most. 82 *paucorum mensum sunt relictæ reliquiae*. Professor Bennett does not note separately whether a genitive ever takes the place of the adjective with the genitive in this kind of qualitative expression (contrast his remark on the genitive with *medicamento*, in an ablative qualitative expression, page 323). I see no such instance, however, in his lists for the genitive, 65-68. Nor does he pick out the examples of the qualitative genitive in predicate use and set them over against the examples of

<sup>1</sup>On page 323, under the Ablative of Quality, there are not sufficient references back to the discussion of the Genitive of Quality. Thus, under *ingenio*, there is no mention even of Most. 814, which, on page 65, is said to be the sole instance of *ingeni* in a genitive of quality construction. The ablative lists on page 393 are in several instances less full than the ablative lists on page 65, a page devoted primarily to the genitive.

<sup>2</sup>In Juvenal 11. 32 *ancipitem seu tu magno discrimine causam protegere adfectas*, Mr. Duff calls *magno discrimine* an ablative of quality. Why join an ablative of quality and an adjective to one noun, and not adjective and genitive of quality? For pertinent examples see Juvenal again, 14. 146, and 14. 157-158. On 3. 48 *nulli comes exeo tamquam mancus et extinctæ, corpus non utile, dextræ*, Mr. Duff says, "The subject (*homo* understood) has two epithets, *mancus* and *extinctæ dextræ* (= *debilis*); the gen. of quality is used as a roundabout adj. . .". In 13. 148 *veteris qui tollunt grandia templi pocula, adorandæ robiginis*, we have an adjective and a genitive of quality with one noun, with asyndeton, even as in our Plautus passage.

this construction in attributive use, though under the Ablative of Quality, 319-325, he makes two main divisions, A. Attributive Uses, B. Predicate Uses. The genitive examples are, in fact, mostly in the predicate.

The brief discussion of the nature of the Genitive of Quality on pages 67-68 is reinforced by a discussion of the fundamental difference between the Genitive and the Ablative in qualitative expressions, 317-319. On page 68 our author notes that the ten examples he has quoted of the Genitive of Quality in the plural effectually dispose of Wackernagel's view that in Early Latin the plural is never found in this construction. On pages 317-319 he repeats the view, familiar from his Appendix to his Latin Grammar and his The Latin Language, that the genitive of quality properly denotes permanent qualities, whereas the ablative of quality properly denotes transitory qualities. Though, he continues, "the genitive is not used to denote temporary qualities", yet "Even in Early Latin the ablative had begun to abandon its original field of the temporary, however, and to be applied to permanent characteristics (*mulierem pudico ingenio; antiqua fide; etc.*)". Physical and bodily characteristics he makes transitory; hence the ablative should be used to describe them. He definitely mentions color as a transitory thing, because it changes with age (318), yet he forgets that on page 65 he had listed one example of *color* in the genitive of quality. What of the examples cited above, page 286, involving *bidui*, *tridui*, and *decem dierum*? Are things that last two, three or ten days permanent qualities? What of *paucorum mensum* in Most. 82? I should prefer to say that, as the result of free, or, if you will, careless uses of each construction, the two cases became at times interchangeable. Professor Bennett himself freely admits that the ablative of quality did not remain true to its traditions: why strain a point to prove that the genitive of quality had greater staying powers? Compare his unwillingness to admit any logical difference between the genitive and the accusative with verbs of remembering (see below, page 290), and his declaration (97) that the Genitive of Value and the Ablative of Price early became confused (see below, page 292).

Of the Appositional, or Epexegetical Genitive (Genitivus

Definitivus) few examples are given (68). These for the most part involve such expressions as *flagitium hominis*, *monstrum hominis*, *nomen virginis*, *Silari flumen*, *scelus viri*.

On pages 68-70 we have a discussion of the Genitive with Causa, Gratia, and Similar Words. The genitive with *causa* our author regards as probably originally one of possession; "But very early the force of *causa* became virtually that of a preposition, in which function it is extremely common in the early period of the language". There are 85 examples, naturally not all quoted. The examples that are quoted fall easily into two classes (not distinguished, however, in our book), the one of which includes genitives that denote a person, while the other includes genitives that denote a thing (*auri*, *stupri*, *popularitatis*, *consuetudinis*, etc.). The latter class is pretty well represented. In some of these examples, and in some of the like examples with *gratia*, such as Am. 682 *deridiculi gratia*, Cato, fr. 23, 8 (Jordan) *contumeliae causa*, Eun. 877 *contumeliae non me fecisse causa*, *sed amoris*, Acc. 485, *quoius tumulti causa*, is it fanciful to suppose that the expressions arose out of a condensation of the familiar use of *causa* with the gerundive? In any case, the forward-looking, final sense that *causa* with the gerund and the gerundive has is plainly present in these examples. On the other hand, in Cato, fr. 42, 6 (Jordan), *omnia avaritiae atque pecuniae causa fecit*, the relation of the two genitives to *causa* seems not the same; it would be easy to give to *causa* in *avaritiae causa* something of that backward-looking sense, that idea of cause (*ob*, *propter*) which the word seems to have at times in the archaists: see my remarks in Notes on the Prepositions in Gellius, T. A. P. A. xxv (1894), 24-25.

Of *gratia* with a genitive, says Professor Bennett (69), twenty examples occur. The remarks made above on *causa* apply here. In this same general category our author sets examples of the genitive with *ingratiis* (1), *vitio* (3), *vicem* (6), *virtute*, 'thanks to' (6: of the 16 instances in these four classes, 15 are from Plautus, one from Terence), *fini* (1: Cato), *postridie* (1: Cato), *ergo* (15: 10 from Cato, 2 from the Tabulae XII, three others from Inscriptions).

Into the discussion of Free Uses of the Genitive (70-80) it is not possible to follow our author; the material is too diverse. However, to the reference back to the discussion of



such uses on pages 37-38 might be added another to pages 11-12, where too the matter is considered. I turn rather to the Genitive with Adjectives and Participles (82-87). Here the arrangement is by the alphabetical order of the governing adjectives, an order as correct here as was the order followed in the discussion of the Objective Genitive, and for the same reasons. Of the many matters of interest here only one can be considered. Under *adsimilis* we have one example of the genitive, one of the dative (Cato); under *consimilis*, four of the genitive, two with the dative (Accius, Terence). In neither case is there hesitation in seeing a dative use; in neither case is there a reference to the later discussion of the usage with *similis* (86-87), nor under *similis* is there a reference back to *adsimilis* and *consimilis*. *Dissimilis* seems not to occur. In his discussion of *similis* Professor Bennett seems inclined to allow for the dative six instances, all from Plautus, where the dative is given by the MSS (editors, following Ritschl, read the genitive). He quotes, apparently with approval, the point made by T. M. Jones, *Case Constructions with Similis and its Compounds* (Baltimore, 1903), that in four of these instances we are dealing with comparisons and that with the comparative of *similis* the later Latinity usually employs the dative, even of persons. Bennett inclines to read the dative, with the manuscripts, also in Eun. 468. It seems strange that, after allowing, without reserve, the dative with both *adsimilis* and *consimilis*, he should hesitate to grant it also with *similis*.

On pages 88-100 comes the discussion of that important and interesting matter, the Genitive with Verbs. His view of this construction in general Professor Bennett had given on pages 8-10 (not referred to here): see above, pages 276-277. In view of the importance of this usage, I give in full the main rubrics: (1) With verbs of reminding, admonishing (88); (2) With verbs of remembering and forgetting (88-89); (3) With verbs of judicial action (89-90); (4) With verbs of emotion (90-91); (5) With verbs of plenty and want (91-92); (6) With verbs of ruling, having power over (92-93); (7) The type *floci facere*. Value. Price (93-98); (8) With verbs of desiring, scorning, fearing (98-99); (9) Genitive of Respect (99-100).

Under (1) a single example is given: Ru. 743 *meorum me miseriarum communes*. The accusative is the usual construction with these verbs.

Under (2) we read that these verbs are "only sparingly construed with the genitive, the accusative being the more usual construction". The instances actually quoted of the genitive with *memini* and *commemini* show both persons and things in the genitive, more often things; those with *in mentem venit* show only things. The two examples of the genitive with *obliviscor* show persons.

On the genitive here Bennett remarks (1) that the genitive with these verbs is "essentially an Indo-European inheritance. In Indo-European the verb *men-* seems to have governed both genitive and accusative, if we may judge from the fact that in Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Germanic, verbs from this root are found with both cases; see Brugmann, *Grundriss*, ii<sup>2</sup>, p. 590 ff." (2) Yet in the earliest extant Latin the genitive is here much less frequent than the accusative; more oddly still, as time goes on, the genitive increases in frequency. Finally, Professor Bennett refuses to allow any logical difference between the two constructions (89).

Under (3), the Genitive with Verbs of Judicial Action, besides the familiar verbs, we find examples of the genitive with *teneo* (2: Plautus), *capto*, *deprehendo*, *prehendo* (once each: Plautus), *adstringo*, *adligo*, *manum inicio* (twice: Plautus), *perdo*, in the phrase *capitis perdo* (thrice: Plautus), and with *reus sit* (not with *reus* alone, as page 90 might imply; once: Plautus). On page 90 Professor Bennett abandons the view, given in his *The Latin Language*, 327 (1907), that the genitive here is to be explained as resulting from an ellipsis of a noun, *crimine*, *iudicio*, *lege*, or the like: "The early language shows no instance where any of these words is present". Compare his argument later under (7); see below, page 291.

Under (4) we have examples of the genitive with *piget*, *pudet*, *suppudet* (once: Lucilius), *paenitet*, *taedet*, *distaedet* (once: Plautus), *miseret*, *miseretur*, *miserescit*, *commiserescit*, *misereo*, *misereor*, *commiseresco*.

Under (5) we have examples of the genitive with *abundo*, *compleo* (thrice: Plautus), *impleo*, *obsaturo* (once: Terence),

*onero* (once: Pacuvius), *oppleo* (once: Plautus), *saturo*, (once: Plautus), *careo* (once: Terence), *egeo*, *indigeo*, *levo* (once: Plautus), *orbifico* (once: Accius), *privo* (once: Afranius). This construction Bennett regards as Indo-European.

Under (6) we have six examples of *potior* with the genitive. Of these three are due, more or less, to conjecture. Bennett (93) calls this use Indo-European. His case is strengthened, however, by the six instances of *potio* or its passive *potior* with the genitive: cf. e. g. Cap. 92 *est potitus hostium*.

Under (7) Professor Bennett cites with warm approval the views set forth by Wackernagel, *Genitiv und Ablativ*, in *Mélanges De Saussure*, 125 ff., concerning the origin of expressions like *multi facere*, *parvi facere*: "Wackernagel . . . calls attention to Sanskrit formations in which certain *ā*-stems replace the suffix (*ā*) with *ī*, and then combine this as a sort of preverb with *kṛ-*, 'make', *bhu-*, 'become', *as-*, 'be', in the sense: 'to make or become what one was not before'; 'to make some one a sharer in something'; 'to bring something (or to come) into the sphere of something'. Wackernagel not merely identifies this *-ī* with the difficult *-ī* of the Latin and Celtic genitive ending of *o*-stems, but finds a striking similarity of syntactical usage in the Sanskrit compounds just mentioned and the use of the Latin genitive in *-ī* with *facio*, *esse*, and other verbs. From expressions like *multi facere*, *parvi facere*, according to Wackernagel, has developed the Genitive of Value, and later the Genitive of Price. This view is as plausible as it is ingenious, and has already evoked extensive approval in various quarters. I have made it the basis of the following treatment" (93).

First come examples with *facio*. The genitives here are *floci*, *nihili*, *terrunci* (once: Plautus), *compendi*, *dispendi* (once: Ennius), *lucri*, *damni* (once: Plautus), *sumpti* (once: Plautus), *quantum* (twice: Plautus and Lucilius), *tanti* (once: Plautus), *magni*, *multi* (twice: Plautus and Cato), *parvi*, *pluris*, *minoris*, *maximi*, *aequi*, *huius* (once: Terence). The examples with *pendo* show *quantum*, *magni*, *parvi*, *minoris*, *plurimi* (once: Plautus), *nihili*, *floci* (twice, one example suspicious: Plautus). With *est* we find *quantum*, *tanti* (once: Plautus), *tantidem* (once: Plautus), *parvi* (once: Plautus), *pluris*, *maximi* (once: Plau-

tus), *copiae*, *operae*, *nihili*, *nauci* (twice in Plautus, once in Ennius). Then come examples of *nihili*, *nauci*, *trioboli* used attributively, and, finally, examples of this general usage with other verbs, such as *existumo*, *aestumo*, *consulo*, *censeo*, *indico*, *habeo*, *dedico*. Pages 93-97 are thus very valuable pages, that will well repay study. On page 97 Bennett remarks that there is in a large proportion of the foregoing examples a distinct notion of value, so that this genitive has been called often a Genitive of Value. Against the view often maintained (e. g. by Wölfflin in Archiv 9.103) that this genitive is originally a genitive of quality standing for the fuller *tanti preti est*, *parvi preti facio*, he urges (97) that we never find *parvi preti facio*, *magni preti facio*, although, as seen above, the shorter expressions are very common. Compare his argument under (3): see above page 290.

Price was originally denoted by the ablative, value by the genitive, but these ideas lie so close together that the constructions are confused, even in early Latin, so that value is sometimes denoted by the ablative and price by the genitive (97: after Wölfflin, Archiv, 9. 102). Bennett holds also that we cannot distinguish the uses by saying that the genitive denotes indefinite price, the ablative definite price: "Except in the four genitives above cited <*quantī*, *tanti*, *pluris*, *minoris*>, the ablative is regularly used at all periods of the language to denote indefinite price". He connects the genitive of price with the following verbs in Early Latin: *conduco*, *destino*, *do*, *emo*, *libero*, *loco*, *perdoceo*, *posco*, *redimo*, *subigo*, *vendo*. When we come to examine these instances, we find that they all involve *quantī*, *tanti*, *tantidem*, and *minoris*, so that one wonders why they were not rather included above, with the examples of the genitive with *facio*, *pendo*, etc. One instance, Eun. 74, *ut te redimas . . . minumo; si nequeas paululo, at quanti queas*, is particularly interesting, as showing two ablatives, one genitive; the ablative and the genitive occur, in effect, with the same verb (*queo*). The fact that the genitive used is the familiar *quantī* may point to the view that, aside from the very common *tanti*, *quantī*, etc., the ablative is the more natural construction for price, definite or indefinite, even for Early Latin.

Under (8) we have examples of the genitive with *cupio*, *fastidio*, *vereor*, *studeo*.

Finally, under (9), we have examples in which the genitive "apparently has a function similar to that of the Ablative of Specification . . . The usage may have been Italic. It is found in Oscan . . ." Bennett cites examples involving *animi*, *mentis*, *sermonis*, *divini* or *humani*, or *rerum* with *credere* and *adcredere*. There is not space to consider the examples in detail.

It may be noted, however, in conclusion, that Bennett (100) regards *animi* as probably genitive. Such a view "is supported by abundant other instances of similar uses; (2) The expression *animis pendere* is late (Cicero) and rare".

CHARLES KNAPP.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.



### III.—THE DURATION OF THE TROJAN WAR.

In a brilliant essay, *de Compositione Iliadis*, first published in *Mnemosyne* in October, 1910, and reprinted as the first chapter of the author's *Commentationes Homericae*, Leyden, 1911, Professor van Leeuwen seeks to prove that the events narrated in the *Iliad* were conceived of as having taken place not in the tenth year of the war, but soon after the arrival of the Achaians. The capture of Troy is foreshadowed in several passages of the poem as destined to follow at no distant date,<sup>1</sup> and the whole war would therefore have been the business of a single summer.

The theory is iconoclastic, but is supported by an array of evidence which entitles it to a respectful hearing. I propose to review this evidence briefly before suggesting a further consideration which seems to afford some confirmation of van Leeuwen's hypothesis.

(1) Achilles is consistently portrayed as a mere stripling. This van Leeuwen makes clear by a number of citations. Not only do the hero's actions show that he is very young, but that such is the fact is made to appear in the references to him by other characters and by the way in which he is occasionally addressed.<sup>2</sup>

(2) Helen's passionate resentment of the outrage she has experienced at the hands of Paris and her ardent longing for the success of Menelaus are clearly not the emotions of a woman who has been growing accustomed to the conditions of her life in Troy for twenty years.<sup>3</sup> Again, when she looks out from the tower by the Skaian Gate and wonders why her brothers are not present on the field it is natural that the true reason of their absence should not occur to her, for she has left them too recently to surmise that they may be already dead.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Van Leeuwen, *op. cit.*, p. 19, and Z 410-412, 448-465, and X 60-76.

<sup>2</sup> B 774, I 186, A 599 sqq., Ω 394 sq., II init., A 169 sqq., I 356-363, 427-429, A 173, A 609 sq., I 437.

<sup>3</sup> Γ 176, 399 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> ὥς φάτο, τοῖσι δ' ἤδη κάτεχεν φυσίχους αἶα, Γ 243. Here, ἤδη is significant, as van Leeuwen notes.

(3) Priam, in the scene just referred to, may well be represented as ignorant of the identity of the foremost of the Achaian chieftains if this is their first appearance under the walls of Troy, but not if they have already been devastating his little domain for nine years.<sup>1</sup> And Polites, who has been posted on the barrow of Aisyetes to observe the actions of the enemy, brings word to the King—or rather Iris impersonating Polites does—not that the Achaians have at last turned their attention to storming the city itself, but that the war has begun.<sup>2</sup>

(4) The duel between Menelaos and Paris is highly appropriate if the wrong which caused the expedition is still fresh and the war is just beginning. But if it must be thought of as taking place nine years after the landing of the invaders it is a little absurd, for it is then late in the day to seek to spare the Argives the pains of a general *mellay*.<sup>3</sup>

(5) Hector cannot well have wedded the Princess of Thebe during the stress of the Achaian leaguer. The marriage must rather be imagined to have fallen in the peaceful days before the sons of the Achaians came. But their only child Astyanax is still an infant when his father parts from him for the last time.<sup>4</sup>

(6) When Hermes is sent to conduct Priam to the hut of Achilles he makes himself like a youth *πρωτον ὑπηνήτην*,<sup>5</sup> and to the old man's question who he is replies:

Μυρμιδόνων δ' ἔξ εἰμι, πατὴρ δέ μοι ἔστι Πολύκτωρ.  
ἀφνειὸς μὲν ὃ γ' ἔστί, γέρων δὲ δὴ ὥς σύ περ ᾧδε,  
ἔξ δέ οἱ νῆες ἔασιν, ἐγὼ δέ οἱ ἔβδομός εἰμι·  
τῶν μέτα παλλόμενος κλήρῳ λάχον ἐνθάδ' ἔπεισθαι.<sup>6</sup>

This can only mean that to Homer the Myrmidons were young men of twenty or so. In a note on this passage in his new edition of the *Iliad*<sup>7</sup> van Leeuwen quotes the following scholium: *ἔστι τοίνυν δεκαέτης ὧν ἐκλήρωσα*, an amusing testimony to the difficulty of maintaining the traditional view.

<sup>1</sup> Γ 166 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> B 796 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Γ 67 sqq., 245 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> Z 400. See Comm. Hom. VIII, p. 132 sqq., de Ultimo Hectoris cum Uxore Colloquio.

<sup>5</sup> Ω 348.

<sup>6</sup> Ω 397 sqq.

<sup>7</sup> *Ilias, cum Prolegomenis, notis criticis, commentariis. Pars altera, Lugduni Batavorum, MCMXIII.*

(7) In a number of places allies of the Trojans are referred to in such a way as to indicate that they have but recently arrived on the scene of the war.<sup>1</sup>

(8) Nestor is represented as instructing the soldiers how to fight to the best advantage, as if in anticipation of their first battle.<sup>2</sup>

(9) The trench and wall before the Achaian camp were naturally constructed immediately after the Achaians realized that Troy was not to be taken at the first onset. To suppose them made after nine years of fighting is absurd.<sup>3</sup>

(10) Words boastfully uttered over their cups by Achaian or Trojan warriors, before the beginning of the war, are recalled by them as though recently spoken.<sup>4</sup>

(11) In the speech of Odysseus in B, van Leeuwen punctuates thus :

ἔστέ δὲ πάντες

μάρτυροι, οὓς μὴ κῆρες ἔβαν θανάτοιο φέρουσαι  
 χθιζά τε καὶ πρωῒζ'· ὅτ' ἐς Αὐλίδα νῆες Ἀχαιῶν  
 ἡγερέθοντο κακὰ Πριάμῳ καὶ Τρωσὶ φέρουσαι,  
 ἡμεῖς δ' ἀμφὶ περὶ κρήνην ἱεροὺς κατὰ βωμοὺς 305  
 ἔρδομεν ἀθανάτοισι τελέεσσας ἐκατόμβας,  
 καλῇ ὑπὸ πλατανίστῳ, ὅθεν ῥέεν ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ,  
 ἐνθ' ἐφάνη μέγα σῆμα· δράκων κτλ.<sup>5</sup>

The phrase *χθιζά τε καὶ πρωῒζ'* will then be no more than an ordinary oratorical device to minimize the time—perhaps actually amounting to five or six weeks—which has elapsed since the Achaians landed. But even with the usual punctua-

<sup>1</sup> Pandaros, E 192 sqq.; the sons of Eurydamas, E 149 sq.; of Diocles, E 550-560; Iphidamas, A 227 sqq.; Imbrios, N 172-175; Othryoneus, N 363 sqq.; Melanippos, O 547-551; Euphorbos, II 811. Also Rhesos, K 434, and Asteropaios, Φ 156.

<sup>2</sup> B 362 sqq. Cf. A 303-309.

<sup>3</sup> H 437. Leaf has the following note on M 7: "This line, but for the passage in H describing the building of the wall, would naturally imply that the wall had been put around the ships from the first, as an essential precaution. It is likely enough that this was the original idea; the explanation in H that it was built in a sudden emergency being an afterthought when the whole stratum containing the wall came to be incorporated with the *Menis* and *Diomedea*, which knew nothing of it". This inconsistency vanishes the moment we accept van Leeuwen's hypothesis.

<sup>4</sup> Θ 229 sqq. T 83 sqq.

<sup>5</sup> B 301 sqq.

tion (colon after *φέρουσαι* (302), comma after *πρωτῆς*) this seems the obvious and natural interpretation of the words,<sup>1</sup> nor is it likely that that of Lehrs would have been suggested had not the phrase when taken with *ἐφάνη* (308) seemed to make Odysseus speak of ten years, with patent absurdity, as 'these few days'.<sup>2</sup>

The new argument was suggested to me by van Leeuwen's assumption that the raid on which Achilles sacked Thebe and other towns was the first offensive operation of the invaders after their landing at the mouth of the Skamander.<sup>3</sup> Since the appearance of van Leeuwen's book this episode has been set in a fresh light by Dr. Leaf, in his *Troy: an Essay in Homeric Geography*, Macmillan, 1912. His examination of the region along the Gulf of Adramyttium has enabled him to combine the scattered allusions in the Iliad into a vivid and plausible history of this "Great Foray", as he conceives it to have been related in some epic which was familiar to the people for whom the Iliad was composed.

Leaf's reconstruction of the story is, briefly, as follows: Achilles starts from the Hellespont one afternoon with at least the whole of his own contingent of 50 ships and from 3000 to 6000 men, having presumably sent ahead a fleet of cargo ships to bring back the plunder. Making at once for the most distant point he proposes to include in his operations, he rows and sails the seventy miles between the Achaian camp and the head of the Gulf of Adramyttium in about thirteen or fourteen hours. At dawn on the following day he beaches his ships and at once marches against Thebe. The town is only an hour's distance from the shore, and is at once assaulted and taken. Here Eëtion is killed and his wife, Andromache's

<sup>1</sup> "A few days ago, when the ships of the Achaians were gathering at Aulis".

<sup>2</sup> Lehrs, de Aristarchi Studiis Homericis, p. 367, takes the phrase with *ἡγερέθοντο*, "vix cum Aulida advecti eramus, tum (v. 308) portentum accidit". This explanation Leaf regards as "far the best".

For van Leeuwen's explanation how the ten-year tradition came to be foisted upon the Iliad, and his discussion of B 295 sq. *ἡμῖν δ' εἰνατός ἐστι περιτροπέων ἐνιαυτὸς ἐνθάδε μιμνόντεσσι*, and the other passages which he regards as interpolated, or corrupt, as well as for several minor items on the positive side of the account, I must refer the reader to his article.

<sup>3</sup> Op. cit., p. 18,

mother, is captured. Here too Chryseis is captured and much booty of various kinds. But, since it is summer, the cattle are high up "on the Alp". So Achilles, sending back the booty from Thebe to his ships, leads his men up Mt. Ida, by the same path afterward used by Xerxes on his march to Abydos. In the pastures high up on the ridge he finds not only the flocks and herds of Thebe and the neighboring town Lyrnessos but also those of Dardania, under the care of no less a personage than Aineias himself, who has had no warning of such a danger and is taken by surprise. There the seven sons of Eëtion are killed, and the sons of Priam, Antiphos and Isos, are taken alive, to be subsequently disposed of for a ransom. The cattle, the rest of the herdsmen, and Aineias are cut off from escaping down the northern slope of Ida and are driven southward to the shores of the gulf. Here the cattle are captured and put aboard the ships, while Aineias and his men take refuge in Lyrnessos (Antandros), which however is soon stormed and plundered in its turn. Aineias again escapes, thanks to the intervention of the gods, and makes his way over the ridge to Dardania. Meanwhile Achilles reëmbarks, with Briseis and the rest of the plunder yielded by Lyrnessos, and continues westward till he comes to Pedasos (Assos), which also succumbs to his attack, despite its strong position. The Myrmidons then sail across the channel, which separates the Troad from Lesbos, and sack a town which Homer calls by the name of the island and which Leaf inclines to identify with Methymna. The passage where this capture is referred to does not explicitly connect it with the raid on Thebe, Lyrnessos, and Pedasos, but as it would be so easily included in this expedition and Achilles is named in both cases as the raider it is not improbable that Leaf is right in assuming that it formed a part of the "Foray".

From Lesbos Leaf thinks Achilles sailed straight home to the Achaian camp, where the booty was divided and Chryseis, with the pick of the Lesbian women, was allotted to Agamemnon.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The places cited by Leaf as bearing on the "Foray" are as follows: A. 366-369, B. 688-693, Z. 414-428, I. 128-130, 186-188, 666-668, A. 101-112, 624-626, II. 152-154, T. 291-300, T. 89-96, 187-194, Ψ. 826-829. See Troy, pp. 242-52, 319 sq., and 397 sqq.



On reading this account of the expedition we realize as never before how significant an operation it may well have been in fact. Not only would it serve to cripple the Trojans by devastating important dependencies of theirs, but Leaf makes it appear very likely that the Lykians were accustomed to unload their cargoes at Pedasos and transport them thence to Troy by pack-trains, in which case the capture of Pedasos and the general cleaning out of that coast would seriously interfere with their trade. Finally the live-stock rounded up in the upland pastures of this large grazing region must have been a very important contribution to the Achaian commissariat.

It is evident that this expedition immediately preceded the opening events of the Iliad. For it is quite clear that Chryses, who in the beginning of the poem comes to the Achaian camp to ransom Chryseis, has not postponed a moment longer than necessary an attempt so fraught with important consequences both as regards his daughter's happiness and his own. The traditional interpretation of the Iliad places its action in the tenth year of the war. Now if the "Foray" had come in the tenth year there would inevitably have been traditions of similar forays made during the other nine years, for the Achaians would require frequently-renewed supplies of cattle—if not of women—and we can hardly suppose that these supplies would either actually come or be traditionally said to come in any other ways than did the cattle collected on this expedition by Achilles.<sup>1</sup> If this be granted, is it not singular that nowhere in the Iliad, with a possible exception to be presently discussed, do we find any reference, however casual, to any raid by Agamemnon's men but this *one*? It is, of course, not surprising that Homer should not have seen fit to narrate at length the story of any other raid. The "Foray" was essential to his plot, leading as it did to the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles, and even the "Foray" is nowhere described by Homer, but only referred to incidentally in some dozen scattered passages. But it does seem odd that these same *disiecta membra* should be found to fit so neatly together into one body, with nothing whatever

<sup>1</sup> Thukydides suggests that piracy was supplemented by the cultivation of the Chersonese (I. II, 1).

left over to start another. How did the Iliad manage to escape a few random reminiscences—associated say with some maiden, goblet, shield, or other article of booty—of some previous expedition? One might perhaps account for the absence of all such evidence upon the hypothesis that there was no other epic source describing such raids among the materials out of which the Iliad was constructed, and it is obviously impossible to disprove such an hypothesis, if any one chooses to make it. But such an explanation would not be very helpful, for it would only shift the difficulty a little farther back, from Homer to Homer's sources.

We know that there were plenty of other Trojan outposts and dependencies waiting for the spoiler. Priam seems to have had herds of cattle at Perkote,<sup>1</sup> and a stud-farm at Abydos,<sup>1</sup> each but a few miles from the Achaian camp, and fulfilling the condition which Leaf lays down of being near the coast.<sup>2</sup> What was the crafty Odysseus thinking of, all those nine years, that he never tapped these convenient sources of supply? Later on he made nothing of pillaging Ismaros.<sup>3</sup> Why was there no descent upon the Thrakes and the Kikones during the progress of the war? Perhaps it would be still more pertinent to enquire why the Achaians should have waited nine years before gathering in the very inviting loot that lay so temptingly spread out along the shores of the Gulf of Adramyttium. "The Foray was a severe blow at Sarpedon", says Leaf.<sup>4</sup> Is it not odd that Achilles should have postponed delivering the blow for nine years? Especially since, as Leaf has plausibly argued, the Lykians were the most important of all the allies of King Priam.

An answer to all these questions is not far to seek. The "Foray" occurred at or near the beginning of a single summer's war, and the beef, mutton, and other supplies which

<sup>1</sup> O 545-551 and Δ 500, with the comments in the editions of Leaf and van Leeuwen.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit., p. 316: "The Greeks have command of the sea, but they dare not venture far from it. There is no trace in the Iliad of any inland expedition farther than the three miles which separate the walls of Troy from the shore".

<sup>3</sup> 40.

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit., p. 320.

it yielded were sufficient to last the army of the invaders all through the campaign.

The possible exception to the statement that no other marauding expedition is mentioned in the poem as having been made by the Achaians is involved in the interpretation we put upon the allusions to Lesbos, Tenedos, and Skyros. We have seen that Leaf connects the reference to Lesbos<sup>1</sup> with the "Foray". Tenedos, Homer tells us,<sup>2</sup> was likewise sacked by Achilles, but the reference to its capture does not explicitly connect it with the "Foray", and Leaf thinks it more likely to have been accomplished on a separate raid. There is however just as much reason to include Tenedos in the "Foray" as Lesbos. In neither case have we anything more definite to go upon than the statement that Achilles made the capture. I fancy Dr. Leaf would have no objection to considering the Tenedos episode a part of the "Foray", were he not a believer in the traditional long war. It is a severe tax upon one's credulity to be asked to believe that Thebe, Lyrnessos, and Pedasos were left unmolested nine years, but so very near a place as Tenedos can hardly be conceived of as exempt from invasion all that time.

The Skyros affair is more puzzling.<sup>3</sup> Van Leeuwen indeed assumes that the Achaians, on leaving Aulis, sacked Skyros, thence steered for Lemnos, where they were given a friendly welcome, and then, sailing southward, captured Tenedos and Lesbos, after which they landed at the mouth of the Hellespont, and Achilles made his descent upon the towns of the southern Troad.<sup>4</sup> This is possibly the way Homer imagined it. It seems odd that the fleet should have commenced its voyage from Aulis to the Hellespont by proceeding so far to the southward of its natural course, which would have been under the lea of the northern Sporades. But a stiff northerly wind may have carried them to Skyros in spite of themselves, and they may then have improved the opportunity to sack the place. The whole episode is complicated by the reference to Neoptolemos in T 326 sq. and Ω 467. Leaf says, in this connection, "Critics in ancient times were disturbed by the ex-

<sup>1</sup>I 128-30.

<sup>2</sup>Λ 624 sq.

<sup>3</sup>I 666 sqq.

<sup>4</sup>Op. cit., p. 18, 43 sq.

treme improbability that Achilles should have entrusted his son to the care of an island which he had so recently plundered, and that he should have plundered an island which was to him almost a home. They therefore inclined to the belief that this Skyros was a city 'in the country which is now Phrygia, but was formerly Kilikia'. What this means we cannot pretend to say, and we must leave Skyros entirely out of account in the story of the Foray, recognizing the bare possibility that in the ancient poem it may have been a city of the Kilikes in the Plain of Thebe".<sup>1</sup> Both Leaf and van Leeuwen<sup>2</sup> however hold the passages in T and Ω to be spurious, for the notion of a son of Achilles is alien to the Iliad. On the whole it seems likely that the Skyros in question was the island. In any case the episode cannot be held to invalidate my contention that there is in the Iliad no reference to any other marauding expedition than the "Foray", during the progress of the war. Skyros the island may have been taken before the Achaians reached the Hellespont, or Skyros the city of the Kilikes may have been taken subsequently to the landing, during the "Foray" itself. Probably no one will think it likely that the island was made the object of an expedition during the course of the war, or that the city of the Kilikes, if captured at all by Achilles, was not captured in the big raid.

There remains to be considered a passage which may be thought to weaken my position. I refer to Achilles' speech in I. The relevant verses are these:

ὥς δ' ὄρνις ἀπτῇσι νεοσσοῖσι προφέρῃσι  
 μᾶστακ', ἐπεὶ κε λάβῃσι, κακῶς δ' ἄρα οἱ πέλει αὐτῇ,  
 ὥς καὶ ἐγὼ πολλὰς μὲν αὐπνοὺς νύκτας ἴανον, 325  
 ἥματα δ' αἵματόεντα διέπρησσον πολεμίζων,  
 ἀνδράσι μαρνάμενος δάρων ἔνεκα σφετεράων.  
 δώδεκα δὲ σὺν νηυσὶ πόλεις ἀλάπαξ' ἀνθρώπων,  
 πεζὸς δ' ἑνδεκά φημι κατὰ Τροίην ἐρίβωλον  
 τᾶων ἐκ πασέων κειμήλια πολλὰ καὶ ἐσθλὰ 330  
 ἐξελόμην καὶ πάντα φέρων Ἀγαμέμνονι δόσκον  
 Ἀτρεΐδῃ· ὃ δ' ὀπίσθε μένων παρὰ νηυσὶ θοῇσι

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit., p. 251.

<sup>2</sup> In their editions, ad locc.

δεξάμενος διὰ παῦρα δασάσκετο, πολλὰ δ' ἔχεσκεν.  
 ἄλλα δ' ἀριστήεσσι δίδου γέρα καὶ βασιλεῦσι,  
 τοῖσι μὲν ἔμπεδα κείται, ἐμεῦ δ' ἀπὸ μόνου 'Αχαιῶν 335  
 εἴλετ', ἔχει δ' ἄλοχον θυμαρέα· τῇ παριαύων  
 τερπέσθω.

Achilles says that he has captured twelve cities with a fleet, and eleven by land, "throughout deep-soiled Troy-land". At first blush one would say that Homer must then have thought of the "Foray" as only one of a number of raids made by Achilles. But there are good reasons for believing that this would be a mistaken inference, and that despite this seeming contradiction Homer knew of only the one raid.

In the first place the passage is highly rhetorical. Achilles is painting in vivid colors the greed and arrogance of Agamemnon. The dramatic exigencies of the situation demand that the grievance be made as glaring as possible. I do not, of course, mean that *Achilles*, who hates like the gates of hell a man who says one thing and conceals another in his heart, is exaggerating, but that the *poet* is improving a bit on his sources for the sake of enhancing the effect of his hero's denunciations. But, it may be objected, if such was his purpose, why did he not use some vague expression like 'many cities', instead of flying in the face of his authorities, who seem to have furnished him with the names of no more than six? I might reply that inasmuch as Homer has nowhere told the story of the "Foray" in detail he cannot be held to contradict himself if he chooses to imply here that twenty-three cities were involved in it. But it would probably be nearer the mark to suggest that Homer seems not to be thinking of the tradition at all, or to be concerned with the question whether the Achaians made one raid or a dozen. His sources have familiarized him with the conception of Achilles as a sacker of Trojan cities and he is now making use of that idea to point the ingratitude of Agamemnon. Like most poets he prefers a definite expression to a vague one and therefore pitches upon two numbers large enough to suit his purpose. The particular numbers selected are apparently a kind of 'round numbers'. Twelve as a round number scarcely requires illustration. Good instances are K 488, the



twelve warriors (nameless like our twelve cities) slain in the camp of Rhesos,  $\Lambda$  692, the twelve sons of Neleus (no name but that of Nestor),  $\Sigma$  230, the twelve nameless Trojans overthrown in the panic when Achilles shouted at the trench, and  $\Sigma$  336, the twelve victims Achilles promises to slay at the pyre of Patroklos. For eleven see van Leeuwen's note on  $E$  193 (the eleven chariots of Lykaon), where he cites  $Z$  319 (the eleven-cubit spear of Hektor),  $\Theta$  494 (the same),  $O$  678 (the  $\xi\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{o}\nu$  of Aias, which was twenty-two cubits long =  $11 + 11$ ),  $\Psi$  264 (tripod holding twenty-two metra), and  $\iota$  241 (stone which twenty-two wagons could not have moved). The number seems to have originated as  $10 + 1$ , with which we may compare our baker's dozen, =  $12 + 1$ .<sup>1</sup>

If it be held simpler and easier to account for the numbers here by the assumption that Homer was merely following his sources and that there really were old traditions attributing to Achilles the capture of twenty-three cities, there are two arguments which may be brought forward in reply.

(1) It is strange that of all these twenty-three only five (six, counting Skyros) are anywhere alluded to by name, and that these five were taken in a single expedition and lay in the same neighborhood. And it is also noteworthy that in the passage quoted, though Achilles speaks as though Agamemnon had habitually wronged himself and the other chieftains, yet the only instance of oppression he cites is precisely the case of Briseis.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> References are also given to illustrate the analogous use of thirteen, =  $12 + 1$ . For thirteen see also Elmore, On Aristophanes, Peace 990, and Postgate, Uncanny Thirteen, both in Classical Review XIX (1905), pp. 436 sqq. Postgate says "The numeral does not stand for a familiar group, nor does 'thirteen' in this sense mean 'thirteen, more or less'. But both its use and its nuances appear explicable if we analyze it as a group and a unit,  $12 + 1$ , and suppose that by the addition of the unit the number seemed to the popular fancy to break out into a new series and escape by the opening of a door, as it were, into the indefinite. It would thus belong to the same type as the popular expression 'a year and a day'".

<sup>2</sup> Similarly in the quarrel scene in  $A$  (149-171) Achilles implies that Agamemnon has been *repeatedly* selfish in the division of booty and that the chief of the fighting has *repeatedly* fallen to his own share. Here again we have impassioned rhetoric—not history. But at worst the contradiction of the single-raid tradition is not a very glaring one,

(2) There are not enough towns in Homer's Troad to make up the eleven, unless we include some which are alluded to in such a way as to show that Homer regarded them as being intact at the time of the action of the Iliad. Including Dardania, which however Leaf regards as a district and not a town,<sup>1</sup> Homer mentions fifteen cities of the Troad. Of these Zeleia<sup>2</sup>, Perkote,<sup>3</sup> Arisbe,<sup>4</sup> Larisa,<sup>5</sup> and Paisos,<sup>6</sup> are excluded by the terms in which they are referred to, leaving only ten. But of these ten it seems necessary to eliminate Chryse, for it was from Chryse that the priest Chryses came, after the "Foray", to ransom his daughter, and thither Odysseus afterward escorted the lady and the hecatomb, in order to obtain the forgiveness of Apollo.<sup>7</sup> Killa,<sup>8</sup> which lay somewhere in the neighborhood of Thebe, may also safely be counted out, for its capture would almost surely have been mentioned in one or more of the passages dealing with the sack of Thebe

since several cities, and several distinct groups of slaves and heaps of booty fell to be divided, and may be thought of—if any one thinks it worth while to justify a poet in such minutiae—as divided up in separate lots.

<sup>1</sup>"It is clear that the Homeric Dardania was not a town, as some have supposed, but a district inhabited by dwellers in villages. This is the natural condition of a fertile plain lying far from the sea [i. e. the upper valley of the Skamander], and protected from invaders as well as pirates by mountains and hill-country on every side. It is further indicated by the words of Homer, who speaks of Dardania as 'colonized' (κτίσσε δὲ Δαρδανίην), while the different status of 'holy Ilios' as a town is doubly insisted upon (ἐν πεδίῳ πεπόλιστο, πόλις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων). The distinction is real and essential, marking a great step in economic progress". Troy, p. 180.

<sup>2</sup>εὐχεο δ' Ἀπόλλωνι Λυκηγενεῖ κλυτοτόξῳ  
ἀρνῶν πρωτογόνων ῥέξειν κλειτὴν ἑκατόμβην  
οἴκαδε ροστήσας ἱερῆς εἰς ἄστυ Ζελεΐης. Δ 101 sqq.

<sup>3</sup>τὰς μὲν ἔπειτ' ἐν Περκώτῃ λίπε νῆας εἴσας,  
αὐτὰρ ὁ πεζὸς ἐὼν εἰς Ἴλιον εἰληλούθει. Λ 239 sq. (cf. 328 sqq.)

<sup>4</sup>κεῖθεν δὲ ξεινός μιν ἐλύσατο, πολλὰ δ' ἔδωκεν,  
Ἴμβριος Ἡετίων, πέμψεν δ' ἐς δῖαν Ἀρίσβην. Φ 42 sq.

<sup>5</sup>ὁ δ' ἄγχι' αὐτοῖο πέσε πρηνὴς ἐπὶ νεκρῷ,  
τῇλ' ἀπὸ Λαρίσης ἐριβώλακος, οὐδὲ τοκεῦσι  
θρέπτρα φίλοις ἀπέδωκε, κτλ. P 300 sqq.

<sup>6</sup>καὶ βάλεν Ἀμφιον, Σελάγου υἱόν, ὃς ῥ' ἐνὶ Παισῷ  
ναῖε πολυκτῆμων πολυλήϊος. E 612 sq.

<sup>7</sup> A 431.

<sup>8</sup> A 38, 452.

and Lyrnessos. Abydos<sup>1</sup> too would seem to have been undisturbed, for as Leaf points out, the crossing from Sestos to Abydos is tacitly assumed to be open in the case of Rhesos and his Thrakians, who in K have recently arrived on the field, unknown to the Achaians, and in the story of Lykaon, who seems to have been sent home, after being ransomed, by the same route.<sup>2</sup> Finally, Dardania was the seat of Aineias, next to Priam and Hektor the most important personage on the Trojan side, and for this reason, supposing Homer to have thought of it as a town, the possibility that he should have passed over in silence the capture of this town by his hero seems sufficiently remote. We are therefore left with six towns, of which Homer specifies three as having been taken by Achilles, while three more (Adresteia, the "steep hill of Tereia", and Pityeia) are only once named, and without the least hint as to their fate.<sup>3</sup>

In weighing this argument against allowing Homer to have had traditional warrant for Achilles's twelve plus eleven towns we ought, no doubt, to consider the possibility that he may have carelessly referred to a town as though it still flourished, despite the existence of ancient testimony to its destruction by Achilles. This would be a less conspicuous slip than he seems actually to have made in N 658 sq., where he refers to Pylaimenes as still living, after having mentioned his death in

<sup>1</sup> Δ 500, P 584. In both these places, moreover, the language seems to imply that the town is safe.

<sup>2</sup> Troy, p. 318.

<sup>3</sup> B 828 sq. Kabesos (N 363) is variously located by the scholiasts, who were obviously quite at a loss in regard to its situation. Othryoneus came thence to woo Cassandra. Pedaios (N 172) is also an otherwise unknown place. Imbrios, who had wedded a daughter of Priam, and whose home was in Pedaios, had come, like other vassals, to help in the defence of Troy. Aisyme (Θ 304) was the home of Kastianeira, mother of Priam's son Gorgythion. Nothing is known of its site. There is a bare possibility that one or more of these three places may have been Trojan towns. The marriage relationships with Troy hardly count for much. Hekabe herself, as Leaf notes (Troy, p. 274), came from Phrygia. Granting, however, that they were in the Troad, and including them in our list of possibilities (though in no case is there a shred of evidence that Homer thought of them as plundered), we still have a total of only nine.

E 576. There is perhaps an instance of similar carelessness in Φ 86 sq.:

\*Αλτεω δὲ Λελέγεσσι φιλοπτολέμοισιν ἀνάσσει,  
Πήδασον αἰπήεσαν ἔχων ἐπὶ Σατνιόεντι.

for in B 690 and Y 92 we are told that Achilles had sacked Pedasos. Van Leeuwen is inclined to look with favor on an old variant, ἀνάσσει,<sup>1</sup> but Leaf suggests another explanation of the apparent inconsistency. "Had he [Altes] been slain", he writes, "we should probably have heard of it. The warrior Elatos, whose fall is related in VI. 33-5, seems still to have had a home there, as though some at least of the Lelegian inhabitants had returned to the ruins of their town".<sup>2</sup>

But with all due allowance for the likelihood that Homer occasionally nodded, it would still be rash to deny that the evidence I have cited for the elimination of all but six towns is sufficiently cogent to justify the conclusion either that Homer knew of a number of Trojan towns which he nowhere saw fit to name, in or out of the Trojan Catalogue, or that he invented the number ascribed to the victorious record of Achilles in I. And where, if not in just such a splendid rhetorical passage as this, should we expect a great poet to allow his imagination to depart from the strict letter of history? "The Iliad is a great deal more"—as Leaf reminds us in another connection—"than the versification of an old chronicle".<sup>3</sup> When we resort to the poem for information about the tradition which lies at its foundation we may rightfully draw inferences from the mention of this or that city regarding the make-up of the Achaian or the Trojan army. Such things are not likely to have been invented. But we must guard against the fallacy of assuming that the feats of arms ascribed to the epic hero are based on historical data. When Homer makes Achilles boast of having taken twenty-three cities there is just as little likelihood that he is speaking by the book as when he tells us how Euphorbos had, in a certain fight, "cast

<sup>1</sup> Van Leeuwen, *Ilias*, ad loc.

<sup>2</sup> Troy, p. 247. Ω 543 sqq. is not a case in point. Lesbos is called Μάκαρος ἔδος by way of clearer identification of the geographical point in question, and the propriety of the phrase is scarcely affected by the fact that the place has recently been sacked and, it may be, destroyed.

<sup>3</sup> Troy, p. 16.

down twenty men from their chariots, though then first had he come with his car to learn the lesson of war".<sup>1</sup> If we could ask Homer to supply us with the names and addresses of the twenty warriors whom this hopeful young beginner overthrew in his maiden battle I am afraid we should sadly embarrass him. And very likely he would be equally at a loss for the names of the twelve henchmen of Rhesos already referred to, and of the twenty-three cities of Achilles.

B. O. FOSTER.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

NOTE.—I was not aware of Professor John A. Scott's paper on 'The Assumed Duration of the War of the Iliad', *Class. Phil.* 8 (1913), p. 445 sqq., until my own article had reached the stage of page proof. I trust Mr. Scott will accept my apologies for writing (p. 294 *supra*) as though Professor van Leeuwen's views had not yet been seriously criticised. With the Editor's permission I hope to discuss Mr. Scott's objections to the short-war theory in a later number of the Journal.

B. O. F.

<sup>1</sup> II 810 sqq., or how the young Nestor slew his hundred (A 748 sq.), or Patroklos his 'thrice nine' (II 785). This latter number is a round one, like the others. Cf. van Leeuwen's comment: "numerus IX sive III<sup>2</sup>, qui sollemnis est in Iliade et veluti sacrosanctus (cf. A 303-309 al.), nunc etiam augetur (IX × III sive III<sup>3</sup>). Sic Odysseae poeta suum heroem extollens per IX × II *νῆχθήμερα* somnum non vidisse ait ε 278 sq., et alterum numerum sollemnem altero multiplicans procos IX × XII vicisse et interfecisse (cf. α 245-248)".



#### IV.—TWO HOMERIC PERSONAGES.

##### HECTOR AS A THEBAN HERO IN THE LIGHT OF HESIOD AND PINDAR.

When Professor Erich Bethe<sup>1</sup> viewed his mighty structure of *Sagenverschiebungen* built on the foundations already laid by Dümmler<sup>2</sup> he regarded it as impregnable and bomb proof, "bombensicher", and modestly called upon men everywhere to test its great strength by firing at it their biggest guns, "Schleudern Sie gegen ihn die schwersten Granaten Ihrer Kritik". His wish was certainly gratified<sup>3</sup> and he soon heard about his ears such a whirl of missiles that he has not brought forth his "werdendes Buch" into such a naughty and uncivil world.<sup>4</sup> Professor Crusius showed that Bethe based his arguments on flagrant ignorance of the most elementary principles of Greek, e. g., Bethe asserted as a thing beyond dispute that Paris and Deiphobus were worshipped along with Helen as gods in Laconia, and the proof is a passage in a very late writer, Aeneas of Gaza, who has this sentence τὸν γοῦν Μενέλεων καὶ νῆ Δία τὴν Ἑλένην μετὰ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ τὸν Δηίφοβον ἐν Θεράπναις τῆς Λακωνικῆς τοῖς θεοῖς συναριθμοῦντες μετ' ἐκείνων ἄδουσι. This passage he translates, "Numbering Menelaus and even Helen together with Alexander and Deiphobus among the gods, etc". That is, he construes the preposition with the accusative as it would be construed with the genitive. The meaning of course is this, "Menelaus they worshipped, yes and even Helen after her affair with Alexander and Deiphobus". That is, the emphasis is placed on the fact that they made a goddess out of a woman with Helen's past, and there is no reference to the worship of these two Trojans in Laconia.

<sup>1</sup> Neue Jahrbuecher VII, 657, XIII, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Kyrene, Studniczka, Anhang II.

<sup>3</sup> Sitzungsberichte der Königl. Bayer. Akad. 1905, 749.

<sup>4</sup> Since this was written his book "Homer—Dichtung und Sage" has appeared.

There is no other argument for the bold assumption that these two men were once natives of Sparta and received divine honors in Lacedaemon after their death.

Bethe speaks with absolute assurance of a Thessalian Paris, "Alexander nämlich der thessalische Paris", and proves this by a passage from Plutarch, Theseus 34. The passage in question simply tells how Paris had been in Thessaly and been defeated near the Sperchius River, and, as Professor Crusius shrewdly observes, this tale was a later attempt to extend the scope of the plunderings of Paris and to increase the measure of the Trojan guilt. It is out of the question to find in this passage any justification for the assumption implied in the phrase, "der thessalische Paris".

The choice argument of Dümmler and Bethe is derived from the fact that Tlepolemus of Rhodes was slain by his neighbor of the mainland, Sarpedon from Lycia. Here they could find no trace of doubt that the death of that warrior and the scene of the struggle had been bodily lifted and transferred to Troy, a city with which they could have had no possible connection. This argument collapses because of the fact so brilliantly shown by Doctor Leaf in his *Troy* that Lycia depended for existence on her ability to sell her wares in the lands whose commerce passed through the Dardanelles, and that the fate of that country must at some time have been decided in or near the plain of Troy. The facts of geography and commerce show that Sarpedon and his countrymen must have been ardent partisans of the Trojan cause, and also that the people of Rhodes must have been just as eager to break the power which kept them from the rich trade of the Pontus. However much the poet may have adorned the events, he made no mistake in placing the struggle between Rhodes and Lycia at the entrance of the Hellespont. Doctor Leaf has also definitely disposed of the theory that the Trojan war was merely the magnified account of the struggles of early Aeolian settlers endeavoring to get a foothold in Asia.

Dümmler's and Bethe's theory that Hector was a Theban hero transferred to Troy was accepted as an assured fact by Cauer in his *Grundfragen*<sup>2</sup>, p. 195, and he adds this sentence 'Und so haben wir hier ein anschauliches Beispiel von dem Inhalte, den der epische Gesang schon im Mutterlande, vor

der Zeit der aeolischen Kolonisation, gehabt haben muss". The fact that Hector appears as fighting at Troy is explained by Bethe on the theory that the original traditions of Hector were connected with a Troy in Attica and that these were later transferred to the Troad.

We are peculiarly able to test Theban traditions by the writings of two early poets, Hesiod and Pindar. Hesiod outranks any other writer in point of antiquity except Homer, while Pindar in point of time has few rivals, and when to the matter of antiquity is added the fact of his great wealth of myth and traditional allusions he must be regarded as the very greatest authority for all ancient traditions, especially traditions in any way connected with Thebes. These two writers are not only ancient, but what is of far more importance in the present investigation, they are peculiarly independent of Homer, and not only give vast stores of tradition not found in Homer, but even unhesitatingly contradict him. In my Johns Hopkins Dissertation, *A Comparative Study of Hesiod and Pindar*, this sentence was used, "When Hesiod and Homer disagree, Pindar follows Hesiod". We can add to this that Pindar did not feel it necessary to hide behind the shield of Hesiod and that he differed from Homer in matters apparently not touched by Hesiod, e. g. P. XI, 31 describes the death of Agamemnon as taking place at Amyclae, while Homer tells how he was slain in his palace at Mycenae. Frag. 262 (Christ), describes the havoc wrought by Rhesus on the ranks of the Greeks, while in Homer this same warrior is slain before he can raise his spear in battle. We are confident that in coming to Hesiod and Pindar we are coming to untainted literary sources, and that respect for Homer will not dry up the springs of Theban tradition in regard to Hector.

Hesiod has no especial interest in Thebes except in so far as he had the misfortune to have been born at Ascra, a neighboring village, and was familiar with all Boeotian traditions, but with Pindar it was different, he loved Thebes, and in her deep misfortune she was still more dear, he resented the implication found in the phrase "Boeotian swine" and he strove to draw the glance of his contemporaries away from the present sad condition of his native city to her proud position in Hellenic mythology. What a large place Thebe, Cadmus,

Semele, Heracles, and Dionysus have in his poems! The wealth of Theban tradition in Pindar can be appreciated by no one who has not given that particular phase the most careful study. We are on safe ground when we do not doubt that Pindar would have used the patriotic self-devotion of Hector in defending the Thebes that was to somehow atone for the treacherous leaders of the Thebes that is. What do Hesiod and Pindar tell us of Hector and of the city he defended?

HESIOD.

Hector's name is not found in any of the extant poems of Hesiod, and there is not a word in any scholiast or in any writer early or late to give the least indication that Hesiod ever used the name Hector. The one warrior who fought on the Trojan side named by him is Aeneas, and he tells how Aeneas was conceived on the slopes of Ida, i. e. Aeneas did not belong to Europe, but to Asiatic Troy. It is evident that Aeneas' place in tradition is independent of Homer, and his name has no transparent Greek derivation.

Hesiod O. 165, places those warriors in the Islands of the Blest, who had gone in ships over the great crest of the sea to recover the fair-haired Helen:

τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐν νήεσσιν ὑπὲρ μέγα λαῖτμα θαλάσσης  
ἐς Τροίην ἀγαγὼν Ἑλένης ἔνεκ' ἠγκόμοιο.

These two verses are most significant, since they prove what the tradition was in European Greece. Granted that the Greek colonists or exiles took their own songs with them and substituted the new names for the old, putting an Asiatic Troy where once an Attic Troy had been, but how are we to account for the fact that right here, back in the old home, a Boeotian poet is singing of that same Asiatic Troy? Had Hesiod lived a century or two later we could say he was influenced by Homer, but we cannot accept that answer for a poet of marked independence of Homeric tradition, who was also almost, if not quite, a contemporary. Again in O. 651 he speaks of the Greek ships gathering at Aulis while preparing for their long voyage to Troy.

Many incidental details of tradition not found in Homer are given by Hesiod, e. g. Frag. 15, Rzsch, tells why Nestor was

given the title the Gerenian, Frag. 89, names Xanthe as the mother of Machaon, and Frag. 97, tells who was the wife of Sthenelus. These minute matters show that Hesiod was familiar with traditions of heroes found in Homer which are not given by that poet himself, but he has not a word to tell us in regard to Hector, and he knows nothing of the transference of any scene from Hellenic soil to the Eastern Aegean.

This evidence, though for the most part negative, is exceeding strong.

#### PINDAR.

Pindar in this matter is an authority of the greatest weight, indeed he could hardly speak with greater influence, since he is early, is rich in traditions, does not feel bound to follow Homer, and above all he is a Theban, proud of Thebes' traditions, eager to tell them.

Hector is an especial favorite of Pindar who regards him with a peculiar affection and esteem. In O. II, 89 Achilles is praised as one who by his great prowess "cast Hector down, the invincible, steadfast, pillar of Troy". This is, of course, founded on the Iliad and was evidently composed under the influence of these verses:

Z 402. τόν ρ' Ἑκτωρ καλέεσκε Σκαμάνδριον, αὐτὰρ οἱ ἄλλοι  
'Ἀστυνάκτ'· οἷος γὰρ ἐρύετο Ἴλιον Ἑκτωρ.

The play on the word Hector is plainly seen in both Homer and Pindar. Pindar's words are:

ὃς Ἑκτορ' ἔσφαλε, Τροίας ἄμαχον ἀστραβῇ κίονα.

These two poets agree in making Hector the support of Troy. Do they speak of a different Troy? Where is Pindar's Troy situated? He does not leave us in doubt, since he refers to Achilles as one driven by the blast of the sea to Troy N. III, 59: θαλασσίαις ἀνέμων ῥιπαῖσι πεμφθεὶς ὑπὸ Τροίαν κτλ. There can be no doubt where Pindar placed the warlike exploits of Achilles, and accordingly where he put the death of Hector. The Troy which lies over the sea can be none other than the Asiatic Troy. Does it seem within the bounds of reason that Pindar with all his love for Thebe should have torn from her crown this precious jewel, Hector, and have honored thereby a foreign city, a city now in ruins?



What could have been Pindar's motive in thus robbing his own city of this great heritage? No one could assume that there was an old tradition that Hector was indeed a Theban, and yet that the tradition known by others was unknown to Pindar. We could draw no arguments from the silences of such a writer as e. g. Solon in regard to traditions, but Pindar dealt in traditions, Theban traditions, yet here is more than an argument from silence, since Pindar definitely assigns Hector and Hector's glory to Asiatic Troy.

In a poem written in honor of a victor from a clan of Salamis, N. II, 14, he uses these words: ἐν Τροίᾳ μὲν Ἑκτωρ Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν. This passage, too, is founded on the Iliad and may refer to the duel between Hector and Ajax or the battle at the ships, or any one of several other scenes. Where does Pindar place this meeting of Ajax and Hector? Here also there can be no ambiguity, since Pindar tells how the blasts of Zephyrus wafted Ajax to Troy, N. VII, 25: ὁ καρτερὸς Αἴας . . . . .

ὄν κράτιστον Ἀχιλῆος ἄτερ μάχα  
ξανθῷ Μενέλα δάμαρτα κομίσαι θαῖς  
ἂν ναυσὶ πόρευσαν εὐθυπνόου Ζεφύροιο πομπαὶ  
πρὸς Ἴλου πόλιν.

This too is Homeric and can be connected with no city on this side of the sea.

Pindar in N. IX sings of the honors of Chromius and compares his glorious defense of his own city with the honors which a similar devotion had brought to Hector, vv. 39 f.:

λέγεται μὰν Ἑκτορι μὲν κλέος ἀνθῆσαι Σκαμάνδρου  
χεύμασιν ἀγχοῦ.

To which the scholiast gives this wise comment: τὸν δὲ Ἑκτορα παρέιληφε καὶ οὐκ Αἴαντα ἢ Ἀχιλλέα, τῷ καὶ τὸν Ἑκτορα μεμαχῆσθαι ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος, ὡς καὶ τὸν Χρόμιον. The location of the Scamander River can hardly be a matter of dispute. How proud Pindar would have been to have compared the devotion of Chromius with a like sacrifice made by a hero of his own native city! How glad to have shown that the glories of Hector belonged to the waters of Dirce? Why did he assign them to the streams of Scamander? Either Pindar was a

traitor to the past glories of Thebes or he never had heard that Hector was not a Trojan, but a Theban hero. It is unthinkable that there should have been local traditions of Hector, and that Pindar, of all men, should have not known them.

In praising Aegina on the occasion of celebrating a victory won by a native of Aegina he dwells on the past glories of the island and bids the muse tell who it was that slew Hector, I. IV, 39. The reply is, as found in Homer, Achilles whose sires sprang from this very Aegina.

Isthmian VI was composed shortly after the serious defeat the Thebans received at the hand of the Athenians at the battle of Oenophyta. Pindar in this ode sings the praises of a Theban victor to whose family this defeat had brought bitter bereavement, and praises the slain as imitating Hector who in the face of hopeless odds chose to die for his native city. This is the Homeric picture of Hector as he was when he parted with Andromache or when he faced Achilles.

When Pindar composed Isthmian VII Thebes had just passed through the terrible disasters which followed the battle of Plataea. The loss of honor was more awful than the loss of life, and the poet can scarcely lay aside his grief to answer the summons of the Muse. What a comfort now in this hour of shame if he can claim Hector as a child of Thebes and direct the angry glances of men to that better day, that fairer name! He does nothing of the sort, but he tells instead of the exploits of Achilles, of his crossing the sea for the honor of the sons of Atreus, and of his slaying the "high-minded Hector." v. 55: *ὑπέρθυμον Ἑκτορα*.

Pindar mentions Hector by name no fewer than six times, yet he never suggests that he was in any way connected with Thebes, but always makes him the hero and defender of Asiatic Troy. Can any one in the face of this significant fact assert that Pindar knew that at one time his own much-admired Hector was the support of his own beloved but ill-starred Thebes, and yet suppressed this knowledge in silence? What is the use of quoting in the face of this fact writers who lived long after the time of Christ or late authors who had no concern or interest in the glory of Thebes?

Not only does Pindar sing of no Hector except the Trojan

Hector, but what is far more significant he has no knowledge of that Hector except as he found it in Homer. It is easy to put one's finger on some passage in the Iliad which justifies and explains every Pindaric reference to Hector. Pindar was no docile follower of Homer, as I have already shown, and beyond that he often adds details not mentioned in the Iliad, e. g. N. III, 46, he tells how Achilles, because of his unusual fleetness of foot, captured deer without nets or dogs. This is a touch not founded on Homer, yet in harmony with the phrase "the swift-footed Achilles". Why does he add no lines or give no new features to the Homeric picture of Hector? Why did he not at times follow some other tradition? The answer is easy. *There was no other tradition of Hector for him to follow.*

Homer first drew the portrait of Hector and gave him a name, a Greek common noun, and made it a proper noun, the name of a hero. Hesychius tells us that Sappho used this epithet in addressing Zeus, and it was later the name given to the anchors of a ship. This defender was made flesh in Hector. How transparent most of the names given to Hector and his family, Astyanax, Deiphobus, Helenus, Polydorus, Polites, Antiphonus, and Agathon! While the names of those heroes who undoubtedly belonged to tradition do not so easily show their origin, such as Peleus, Tydeus, Ajax, Achilles, Odysseus, Icarius, and Bellerophon.

Why are these names so dark while the names of Hector and his family so transparent? The reason is this, the names of Hector and his brothers, except Paris, do not belong to tradition, are not traditional names. Bethe is quite right in saying that we are not in general to look to Homer for the source of the material used by lyric poets, and I may add that is because they drew on tradition for their myths and their matter, and Homer is not tradition. The Athenian dramatists found mines of wealth in each member of the Epic Cycle, but made little use of Homer as a source. There may be tradition in Homer, but it is only an incident, his aim is poetry; also there might have been poetry in the Epic Cycle, but it was only an incident, its aim was tradition. Homer is not a reservoir of tradition, but he too went to the same source as the lyric poets and the dramatists, here he found his hint for

the Wrath of Achilles, and here Sophocles found a hint for his Ajax, his Electra, and his Philoctetes. Homer stood in just the same relation to tradition as Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. Pindar depended on Homer for his picture of Hector, and later ages had no orthodox view of this hero, hence a grave near the Hellespont and one at Thebes. Two graves were a luxury and so on the basis of the story given in Herodotus of the method by which at the bidding of the oracle Sparta secured the bones of Orestes Greek rationalism used a similar oracle for accounting for the grave of Hector at Thebes. The oracle and the grave were both unknown to Thebes in the time of Pindar, and no tradition whose birth was subsequent to Pindar deserves mention in discussing Homeric origins.

#### CONCLUSION.

The fact that a Theban Hector never appears in the poetry of Hesiod or Pindar is conclusive proof that the theory which makes of him a local Greek hero is pure fiction. Also the fact that Pindar with all his general independence of Homer does not give a single tradition of Hector not based on the Iliad furnishes telling proof, to my mind at least, that Hector as a hero never existed in tradition outside of Homer. Finally the fact that there was a shrine or grave of Hector at Ophry-nium near the Hellespont finds easy explanation in the fact of the application of this very word "hector" to Zeus. Nothing could have been easier than connecting this divine "hector", this "supporter" with Homer's Hector who was indeed created to be *Τροίας ἀμυχον ἀστραβῆ κίονα*.

#### Part II.

##### PANDARUS IN HOMER.

The part taken by Pandarus in the story of the Iliad was brief, but important; he appeared early in the action leading to the first day's fighting and was slain near the beginning of the Aristeia of Diomedes. It is hard to measure Homer by hours and minutes, yet judging from the events of that day which preceded the entrance of Pandarus, and from those which followed after his death, we can hardly estimate his heroic career as of longer duration than a single hour. His

importance rests solely on the fact that he wounded Menelaus, broke the truce, and thereby prepared the way for further fighting. The Iliad seemed to have come to a definite standstill at the end of the third book, and thus the treachery of Pandarus was the means by which the poet resumed the action of the poem.

Nearly all of those who do not definitely believe in the unity of the Iliad feel that the poet who described the death of Pandarus in book five knew nothing of that warrior's part in breaking the truce, as described in book four. The apparent discrepancy between these two accounts is the basis for Doctor Leaf's argument in his edition of the Iliad, Introduction to E, p. 193: "It is patent that the Diomedea was composed in complete independence of the two preceding books". Many other editors or writers might be quoted to a like purport.

When Pandarus first appears in book four we learn that he is the son of Lycaon, that he is attended by mighty shield-bearing warriors, that he is from the streams of the River Aesepus, from the city Zeleia, that he is "god-like", "blameless" and "valiant", that he is a most skillful archer, able to hit a deer full in the breast as it leaps from a cliff, and that he is the possessor of a wonderful bow, to the description of which the poet devotes seven verses. The accuracy and the detail with which the warrior and his weapon are described mark him as one who is about to play some important part. Although thus strongly stressed the archer does not reply to Athena nor speak a single audible word, and the scene closes with these five verses Δ 122-6:

ἔλκε δ' ὁμοῦ γλυφίδας τε λαβὼν καὶ νεῦρα βόεια·  
 νευρὴν μὲν μαζῶ πέλασεν, τόξῳ δὲ σίδηρον.  
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ κυκλοτερὲς μέγα τόξον ἔτεινεν,  
 λίγξε βιός, νευρὴ δὲ μέγ' ἴαχεν, ἄλτο δ' οἰστός  
 ὄξυβελῆς καθ' ὁμίλον ἐπιπτέσθαι μενεαίνων.

With the speeding of the arrow the archer is apparently forgotten, but every reader feels that he cannot be allowed to escape and that he will reappear to pay for his treason. Homer allows no one to wound a Greek of importance and then to slip off unnoticed in the crowd. Hector and Euphorbus slew Patroclus, but it cost them their lives; Coon thrust



Agamemnon, Socus pierced Odysseus, but they died to atone for their brief glory. There was no treachery in the exploits of the four just named, yet they all met the fate appointed for every Trojan who had the audacity or fortune to wound a Greek chieftain. Paris alone escaped the working of this universal law, since tradition, pre-Homeric tradition, had already decided that his death is to follow the death of Achilles. The man who wounded Menelaus, and by that act became guilty of the basest treachery, cannot escape, Pandarus must appear again and pay with his life for his rashness and his treason. When he next appears he will need no introduction, but will come on as one already known to the hearer or reader. Pandarus remains near the scene of action with quiver open, bow uncovered, and strung, ready for immediate service.

After the wounding of Menelaus events follow each other with bewildering rapidity and Diomedes soon emerges from the confusion as the great champion of the Greeks, whose exploits are likened to a raging torrent which breaking through the dikes devastates vineyards and harvests:

E 93: ὥς ὑπὸ Τυδείδῃ πυκινὰ κλονέοντο φάλαγγες  
Τρώων, οὐδ' ἄρα μιν μέμνον πολέες περ ἑόντες.

Just at this juncture and without a word of introduction, also with no mention of any preparation, Pandarus appears. The verses which immediately follow the two quoted are these:

E 95: τὸν δ' ὥς οὖν ἐνόησε Λυκάονος ἀγλαὸς υἱὸς  
θύνοντ' ἄμ πεδίον πρὸ ἔθεν κλονέοντα φάλαγγας  
αἰψ' ἐπὶ Τυδείδῃ ἐπιταίνετο καμπύλα τόξα,  
καὶ βάλ' ἐπαίσσοντα, τυχὼν κατὰ δεξιὸν ὤμον.

Here not even the name of the archer is given, but we know it is Pandarus from his introduction in the preceding book. There is no reference to his city or to his country, no account of his uncovering his quiver, and none of his stripping and bending the bow. We infer that he is an illustrious archer from the accuracy with which he shoots, but in this particular place the poet tells us nothing. How does it happen that he is so well-prepared that he can use his bow in an instant?

How does it come about that he needs no sort of introduction? Why is so important an actor not even named? The one answer to these and similar questions is that Pandarus has already been introduced, his bow was already prepared for immediate service, and the fact that he is a mighty archer is already known to the hearer.

Those who reject Pandarus from the previous book must prepare for him some similar introduction and exploit before his appearance in E, since no unknown and unnamed warrior could without any preparation and at his first appearance play the part assigned to him in this book.

The arrow aimed at Diomedes did not slay him, but the wound was so serious that when Athena came to join the ranks of the Greeks, E 794 ff., she found him nursing his wound and wiping the blood therefrom. The shot fired at Menelaus was a covert shot, and the Greeks, at least, did not know who had aimed it. Diomedes too seems to have been struck when he was turned away from Pandarus and not to have known by whom he was shot until Pandarus boastingly tells him. The wounding of Diomedes makes the doom of the truce-breaker doubly sure. The fact that Pandarus does not meet his anticipated death at his first appearance after he has broken the oaths is an excellent example of Homeric retardation which Professor Roemer has repeatedly shown is so marked a feature of the poet's style. See Index to Roemer's *Homerische Aufsätze*, s. v. Retardation. Although the death of Pandarus has been postponed he has not escaped.

Pandarus has now become an important character, he has seriously wounded two of the foremost Greek leaders, while no other Trojan has thus far drawn blood from any Greek of importance. We know now that Pandarus is a great master of the bow, and we approve the choice of Aeneas who, ignorant of these two shots, decides to find him and to use his astounding prowess. When Aeneas urges him to aim an arrow at Diomedes he is urging a man with whom the hearer is already familiar, and there is therefore no special introduction. Pandarus replies to his urgings with a speech of thirty-eight verses. The length of this speech shows that he has already won a position of such prominence as to justify the poet in putting into his mouth so many verses, verses almost

exclusively about his own affairs and himself. It is unthinkable that Homer would have allowed so many verses to a warrior of the small importance of Pandarus, if that importance is confined to the fifth book. We learn many things about him which could not be told at his previous appearance. We are told of his horses at home, and why he left them there, and why he came to Troy relying on his bow. He tells us that his failure with his bow has so discouraged him that he will not venture another shot, and even threatens to break and burn this vain weapon. Those who deny to Pandarus of E any part in the breaking of the truce must assume that this unusual dejection comes from the partial failure in a single shot, a shot that severely wounded even if it did not slay Diomedes. Can we believe that a great archer, who had come from afar, with the sole purpose of using his bow, would have been thus dejected by the one shot aimed at Diomedes and that he would refuse to try again? The utter despondency shown in

E 214: αὐτίκ' ἔπειτ' ἀπ' ἐμῆο κάρη τάμοι ἀλλότριος φῶς,  
εἰ μὴ ἐγὼ τάδε τόξα φαεινῷ ἐν πυρὶ θείην  
χερσὶ διακλάσσας· ἀνεμῶλια γάρ μοι ὀπηδεῖ,

demands more than the one partially unsuccessful shot described in this book. Critics reject the three verses,

E 206: ἤδη γὰρ δοιοῖσιν ἀριστήεσσιν ἐφῆκα,  
Τυδείδῃ τε καὶ Ἀτρεΐδῃ, ἐκ δ' ἀμφοτέρου  
ἀτρεκὲς αἶμ' ἔσσενα βαλὼν, ἥγχιρα δὲ μάλλον,

as containing the only reference to the breaking of the truce, but the tone of the whole speech demands just such a shot whether Pandarus mentions it or leaves it in silence. The verses add nothing to the whole, but are in such absolute harmony with the words and spirit of Pandarus that they can hardly fail to have sprung from the poet who created the entire scene.

Few indeed of the Trojan warriors have so much space given to them as is given to Pandarus; the account of his death with its staging extends from E 165 to and including 296, that is, it occupies one-hundred and thirty-two verses. Unless Pandarus achieved some greatness by breaking the

truce he is one of the least important actors in the story of the *Iliad*. Coon who wounded Agamemnon, and thereby changed the whole aspect of that day's fighting, appears, performs his part, and is slain, yet despite his importance the poet tells all this in just sixteen verses, *Λ* 248-263. Socus, who wounds Odysseus, to the great disadvantage of the Greeks, appears, acts, and dies, yet but twenty-two verses, *Λ* 428-449, suffice for his entire career. The duel between Sarpedon, the son of Zeus, and Tlepolemus, the son of Heracles, with the speeches involved, the wounding of Sarpedon, and the death of Tlepolemus, is told within the compass of thirty-three verses, *Ε* 628-662. While even the story of the death of the great Sarpedon, including the discussion in regard to his fate carried on by Zeus and Hera in Olympus, occupies but eighty-seven verses, *Π* 419-505. Why did a poet who so condensed the story of these warriors lavish so many verses in describing the death of Pandarus and its setting? It can hardly be because of any inherent worth or prominence, but must be because he has done something which was of unusual importance in the story of the *Iliad*. His appearance with no introduction and no preparation at the time he shot Diomedes demanded some earlier introduction and preparation, not necessarily any previous act of great moment, but it needed at least some previous appearance. The long scene leading up to his death demands both a previous appearance and some act of most extraordinary significance. What act of any consequence does Homer assign to Pandarus other than breaking the truce?

Pandarus bears a Greek name, and his father has the same name as another actor in the events of the *Iliad*, Lycaon, a son of Priam, hence it is probable that he does not belong to pre-Homeric tradition, but was created by the poet for the one purpose of breaking the oaths and thus setting the battles of the *Iliad* in motion. When this work is done he must reappear and be punished. When he has fallen, as poetic justice demands, Homer has no further interest in him, and he does not even stop to tell what has become of the corpse or to dwell on the fate of those who break solemn oaths.

The poet draws no inferences from the death of this treacherous archer, even if the hearer or reader does.

The fact that Homer passes by his fate in silence is the chief reason which has led certain scholars to deny all connection between the account of the broken truce and this story of his death. Ameis-Hentze to E 294: "Der so nahe liegende Gedanke, dass Pandaros durch seinen Tod den Vertragsbruch büßen musste, bleibt auffallenderweise unberührt". Doctor Leaf, Introduction to E: "As they stand they emphasize the complete silence of Diomedes about the gross treachery of his victim, or of the poet who misses the imperative duty of calling attention to the swift retribution which overtakes the violator of the truce". However there is an emphasis of silence quite as effective as that of words. The traitor beyond all others was Judas Iscariot, and those who tell of his treason were so deeply interested in its results that they might be excused for feeling with unwonted keenness and for pressing to its utmost limits "the imperative duty of calling attention to the swift retribution, etc". But did they feel this obligation? John was in the garden with Jesus when Judas betrayed his Lord with a kiss, yet John never hints at the fate of the traitor, he drew no moral lessons. Luke in his gospel, and Mark in his, failed to make any reference to what became of Judas and how he fared as the result of his treason. Even Matthew, whose gospel alone tells of the death of Judas, makes no comment, but simply says, "And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself." The fact that not one of the gospels draws any lesson from the fate of Judas is ample answer to the charge that Homer could not neglect the opportunity presented by the death of Pandarus of drawing a moral in regard to the doom of traitors.

To demand of the poet that he draw all possible or inevitable conclusions, that he must not only show that treason leads to death, but after the traitor's death he must add the lesson as a Q. E. D., is to demand a thing not always present even in history. When Herodotus gave the reasons which influenced the Persians to land at Marathon in their preparations for an attack on Athens, the first and chief reason was that Marathon was a plain peculiarly fitted for the movements of cavalry, *καὶ ἦν γὰρ ὁ Μαραθὼν ἐπιτηδεύτατον χωρίον τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐνιππεύσαι*, Her. VI, 102. However in the account itself of the battle fought at Marathon Herodotus does not make a single refer-



ence to the Persian cavalry, and mentions neither their absence nor their presence. He never explains why he mentioned the cavalry, in the preparations for landing, yet ignored them at the time of the battle itself.

If these two accounts, the one of the landing, the other of the battle, had been in Homer and not in Herodotus, the proof of diverse authorship would be regarded as final.

Also a second illuminating example from the same author. Darius after the failure of Mardonius and the shipwreck near Mount Athos sent messengers to the various states of Greece demanding earth and water as tokens of submission to the power of Persia. The men of Aegina immediately complied with the demands of the king, wherefor the Athenians were so enraged that they sent envoys to Sparta to charge the Aeginetans with treason to the cause of Greece. In this first account of the visit of the Persian heralds, *Her. VI 48-50*, no reference is made to their treatment either in Athens or Sparta. The inference from the charge laid before the Spartans by the Athenians is that neither of these states met the demands of the king, but it is only an inference as the historian is silent concerning them. Ten or more years later while Xerxes delayed near Pieria his messengers returned bringing earth and water from many of the states of Hellas, but the king was careful to send no messengers to Athens or Sparta. Why? "King Xerxes had sent no heralds either to Athens or Sparta, to ask earth and water, for a reason which I will now relate. When Darius some time before sent messengers for the same purpose, they were thrown at Athens into the barathrum, at Sparta into a well, and told to take therefrom earth and water to their king". *Her. VII 133*. It is only by an accident that we learn of the treatment of the messengers sent more than ten years previously. The natural place, one would think, for Herodotus to have told this story was where he told of the success or failure of their mission, but for some reason he delayed it until he told of a second sending of Persian heralds. No one believes that the author of this second account is different from the author of the first. These illustrations, taken from the New Testament and from Herodotus, show how slow one should be in drawing hard and fast arguments from the silences of an author.

## CONCLUSION.

Pandarus appears in three different but closely related scenes of the Iliad. At the end of the first he is left standing with quiver open and bow uncovered, strung and ready for instant use; he reappears in the second scene with no manner of introduction as one already known to the hearer and with no preparation and without delaying a moment wounds Diomedes. The second scene is impossible without the first. The first and second scenes must have some conclusion, and accordingly demand a third, the traitor must pay for his treason, δράσαντι παθεῖν. The third scene has no setting unless the archer has already more than once failed with his bow, and further the detailed description of Pandarus with the long account of his death presupposes that he has been responsible for some deed of unusual importance. This important deed can be none other than the breaking of the truce by the wounding of Menelaus. No one of these scenes in which Pandarus appears can stand alone. The first might stand without the second, but not without the third, the second demands both the first and the third, while the third has no rational content without the first and the second.

JOHN A. SCOTT.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, February 19, 1914.

## V.—THE DATE OF MENANDER'S ANDRIA.

In the Latin adaptation of the *Andria* by Terence the recognition scene is undoubtedly a translation of the same scene in the original play of Menander. In Act V, iv, lines 904 ff. Crito, Chremes, Pamphilus and Simo appear on the stage. Crito saves the situation for the young lovers when he tells the story of Glycerium. She and her uncle, Phania, had been cast ashore at Andrus many years before, apparently the only survivors of the shipwreck. The uncle died shortly afterwards and Glycerium was taken by Chrysis and her father and cared for. On the death of the latter, Chrysis and Glycerium had journeyed to Athens about three years before the time of the action of the play. They hoped to make a living in the metropolis and to search for the relatives of Glycerium. The search was never prosecuted with any earnestness, either because of the carelessness or indifference of Chrysis, although they had sufficient evidence and information to find them. This may justly be regarded as a defect in the plot. The story of the two women during their life in Athens need not be recounted. On the arrival of Crito at Athens from Andrus Chremes hears for the first time of the fate of his brother and joyfully recognizes Glycerium as his daughter, who is then given in marriage to her lover Pamphilus.

In the story of Glycerium, we have to do with an invented plot, but there are certain elements of probability which enter into the story and enable us to determine the date of the play. If we can determine the date of the shipwreck and the number of years which have elapsed between the shipwreck and the action of the play, we can determine easily the date of its production.

Menander has brought the occasion of the shipwreck into relation with an event in Athenian history which will enable us to determine the approximate date of the disaster. In line 935 of the Latin version of the play we read as follows: is (Phania) bellum hinc fugiens meque in Asiam persequens proficiscitur. Chremes is the speaker and is giving the motive

for his brother's voyage. The line is clearly from the Greek original; for the scene is laid in Attica and no Roman would think of fleeing from Rome to Asia to avoid any danger from internal or foreign foes at this time. Furthermore, the poet might have explained the voyage as one of trade or pleasure, and in bringing in a war as the motive, he must be using some historical event which would be readily recalled and understood by the members of his audience.

When was there a war during which a citizen of one of the country demes of Attica would suffer so severely from an invading army that he would be liable to seek safety in flight to a distant country? We must date the war within the lifetime of the poet and not many years before the production of the play. We must suppose an invading army which is occupying the country for an extended period with no immediate hope of relief. Apparently the sea is controlled by a fleet friendly to Athens; otherwise flight would be virtually impossible. Finally, the war must have been so severe that it would readily be recalled to mind after a lapse of ten or more years.

There are two occasions during the lifetime of Menander when Rhamnus, the home of Phania was invaded. After the defeat of the Athenians off Amorgus in 322 B. C., Clitus landed troops at Rhamnus and proceeded to ravage the *paralia* sending Micion as leader of the band while he returned to the ships. The Athenians under Phocion met and defeated the invaders and slew Micion. Almost immediately afterwards Antipater advanced against Athens from Thessaly, but he was met at Thebes by Phocion and a truce was declared. Clitus and his fleet still controlled the sea (Plutarch, Phocion, 25 ff.). Menander can not be alluding to this piratical landing at Rhamnus or the threatened invasion of Antipater which could not be dignified by the name "war". Moreover the enemy controlled the sea as well as Asia, so that Phania's flight at this time would be practically impossible. Certainly he could not flee to Asia. Nor was the descent on Rhamnus so remarkable that the Athenian audience would be likely to understand a passing allusion to it ten or more years later.

From 322 to 307 B. C. the land of Attica was undisturbed by foreign invasion except for the unimportant advance of

Polyperchon in 318 B. C. (Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 34). After Athens passed into the hands of Antigonos and Demetrius in 307 B. C. the land of Attica was overrun by the invading armies during the four succeeding years and the outlying districts must have been thoroughly plundered to supply the army of Cassander with food and supplies. Cassander did not have a fleet to blockade the harbors or control the shipping until 304 B. C., and the flight of Phania from Rhamnus would have been possible at any time between 306 and 304 B. C. Asia would have been the natural refuge for an Athenian because it was held by the friendly forces of Antigonos. The severity of this 'four years' war' and the extremities to which Athens was brought before she was finally relieved by Demetrius were so great that an allusion to it would be readily appreciated by any Athenian audience after many years. Since this is the only war of invasion except the invasion and capture of Athens in 295 B. C. which came in the last years of Menander's life, we can reasonably assume that Menander had in mind the *τετραέτης πόλεμος* (307-304 B. C.), and that this was the 'bellum' which Phania was seeking to avoid. The date of the flight and the shipwreck, though in themselves fiction, may reasonably be brought into connection with history, and that part of the story may be dated in the years 307-4 B. C.

How much time has elapsed between the shipwreck and the action of the plot? Glycerium was cast ashore when she was a mere child. Apparently she was not old enough to know or remember the name of her father or mother, although she must have known the name of her uncle and his deme when she came to Athens to seek her relatives. Crito and many others on Andrus remembered Phania and could bear witness to his statement that he was a citizen of Rhamnus. Menander apparently represented her to the audience as a girl of not more than four or five years of age at the time of the shipwreck. At the time of the action of the play, she was tall, beautiful, and so graceful that she attracted the attention of Simo at the funeral of Chrysis. Moreover she was old enough to bear a son to Pamphilus. Apparently the audience would assume her to be a girl of sixteen or seventeen at the least. It may be questioned whether the comic poet would



have paid such attention to detail, but if we consider the quick-wittedness of the Athenian audience, we must assume that the action of the play is represented as the sequel of an event which happened twelve or more years before in connection with a great war, the details of which were only too clearly impressed upon their memories.

If we are correct in assuming that the war which Menander uses as the cause of the flight of Phania is a real event with real meaning to the minds of his audience, then we are justified in putting the action of the *Andria* at least twelve years later. This play, therefore, was composed and presented somewhere between 295 and 293 B. C. While it is, perhaps, not advisable to insist on strict historical accuracy in estimating the time between the war and the events of the play, I should prefer to choose the latest date possible and assume that the *Andria*, if not actually the last, was amongst the latest of Menander's plays.

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON.

PRINCETON.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Ovid and the Renaissance in Spain. By RUDOLPH SCHEVILL.  
University of California Press, Berkeley, 1913. \$2.50.  
(University of California Publications in Modern Philology, iv. 1, pp. 1-268, November 19, 1914.)

In my recent review of Magnus' monumental edition of the *Metamorphoses* I said that when at the Renaissance we moderns at last grew weary of our own device in the way of the *Chanson de Geste*, the *Roman d'Aventures*, the *Fabliau*, and their kind, we went back to the greatest story-teller of the Roman world, we sat at his feet, and learned from him as best we could what it is that makes a story immortal and always young. And his influence in this rôle was vital and far-reaching. It is safe to say that no other classical author, perhaps no other author of any race or period, has had so much to do with the development of the various types of narrative literature in the Modern World. One chapter of this story has just been written by Dr. Schevill. It is to be hoped that the remaining chapters, those concerned with Italy, France, England, and the other European nations, will soon follow, and that their authors will possess Dr. Schevill's enthusiasm and thorough grasp of the subject.

The book consists of four chapters: I, Ovid and the Middle Ages; II, Ovid and the beginnings of Renaissance Fiction; III, The *Metamorphoses* retold in Spanish; IV, The General indebtedness to Ovid of the *Siglo de Oro*. There are also (pp. 234-265) four Appendices—containing respectively a Bibliography, a Mediaeval Spanish version of Ovid, *Heroides*, 7 (Dido to Aeneas), the Life of Ovid added by Fernán Núñez to his Commentary on Juan de Mena's *el Laberinto de Fortuna*, and Bustamante's version of the Tale of *Pyramus and Thisbe*.

As the author himself says in substance there are two phases of the influence of Ovid which are especially notable. One led directly to greater subtlety in the delineation of character. 'It inspired principles of fiction, a philosophy and precepts in the art of love, methods of intrigue, specific sentiments applicable to peculiar situations of lovers, together with an analysis of man's attitude toward womankind, aphorisms suitable to the occasion—indeed, various pagan features of the novel of the Renaissance'. Here the main sources are the

Ars Amatoria, the Remedia Amoris, and the Amores. The other phase consists in copying or imitating the romantic and novelistic features of his works. This leads us more directly to the Heroides and the Metamorphoses.

I may remark that this development in the sphere of modern imitation is a close analogy to Ovid's own development. In Ovid's own case, the Amores and especially the Ars Amatoria and the Remedia Amoris present the principles, the Metamorphoses and the Heroides illustrate their application for purposes of narrative. And considering the purpose they had in view, our forefathers of the Renaissance could not have chosen a model more artistic and more inspiring. There is no author in all antiquity who has such a faculty and such a fondness for minute psychological analysis, and it was in this respect above all that the Mediaeval narrator was so woefully lacking. The method is one which naturally makes its appearance only in periods of great intellectual and aesthetic refinement, and for this reason, perhaps, the ancient author most akin to Ovid in this respect is Apollonius of Rhodes, the leading poet of the Alexandrian Age now surviving.

But Ovid's characteristic method of telling a story was a matter of special training as well as of decided taste and surpassing genius. His first work was the Amores, and all that he did afterwards springs from it like so many branches from the main trunk of some shapely tree. How and why this was the case is explained if we bear in mind that he was first, last, and always a rhetorician, further, that he had certain strongly marked tastes in the domain of rhetoric itself. It will be remembered that the Elder Seneca, who knew him personally in the Rhetorical Schools of the Augustan Age, says that Ovid hated argument, and therefore that he never declaimed *controversiae* in the school, unless they were *ethicae*, i. e., questions of conduct. It is added, however, that he was especially fond of *suasoriae*. Now, as every classical scholar knows, some of the most famous pieces in the Amores are really *suasoriae*, the Heroides are nothing more nor less than so many *suasoriae* in epistolary form, the Ars Amatoria is one long lesson in the art of suasion. I may add that many of the finest and most characteristic passages in the Metamorphoses are *suasorial*, and that all those passages painting the conflict of warring impulses in the human breast—and here Ovid is excelled by none—are really so many adaptations of the *controversia ethica*. I need not mention the Tristia and the Epistulae ex Ponto. They are all *suasoriae*.

As might be expected, a large part of Dr. Schevill's study is concerned with the *novela sentimental* or romance of intrigue. This type, now so familiar to us all, is one which, as he believes—and I quite agree with him—we learned how to

write from Ovid. He, therefore, calls it 'The Ovidian Tale of the Renaissance'. The title is peculiarly apt in view of the statement so frequently made that one of the most impressive things about Ovid is his modernity. In view of the actual facts as brought out by Dr. Schevill's own investigation, it would perhaps be better to say that the most impressive thing about modern literary art is its Ovidianity. It is not that Ovid is so much like us, but that we are so much like Ovid. Nor is the influence of the great story-teller alone a matter of construction or of psychological development in the more restricted sense. It is quite as evident in what might be called the accessories. Each story, for example, in that Arabian Nights of the Roman World, the *Metamorphoses*, is set with the appropriate surroundings of natural scenery—woods and mountains, valleys and streams, sea and shore—somewhat conventionalized perhaps, and not especially prominent as compared with the practice of some of our modern poets who have yet to learn the proper function of a background, but never inharmonious and always charming. It is this scenery that lives again in the pages of Ariosto and in the paintings of the Renaissance. Indeed, an interesting monograph might well be devoted to the influence of Ovid, direct and remote, upon modern art. The *Metamorphoses* might be profusely illustrated by paintings still to be found in the great galleries of Europe. Many were directly suggested by incidents in the poem, many more would be entirely appropriate. I might also observe that more subtle but none the less real and significant is what might be called the author's attitude toward his own story. In this respect, one of the most characteristic features, for example, of Ariosto's genius is a certain delightful touch of kindly irony and of whimsical fancy. The attitude naturally belongs to an age of cultivation, the note is still distinctly heard, for instance, in certain authors of the Alexandrian Age. But one of the most notable examples, perhaps the most notable example of it in all literature, is Ovid himself. And when we consider his supreme importance in the formative period of modern prose and poetry, it may be that here, too, his personal influence is a factor to be reckoned with.

Passing now to some matters of detail, I observe that the author notes on p. 5 of his book that 'The popular translation of *Ars Amatoria* has generally been "the art of love" (*el arte de amar*), though the phrase in reality means "a grammar of love", being a book of principles and precepts'. Unless I mistake the point of his statement it appears to me that there is no foundation for his criticism of this use of *ars*, 'art', in either Latin or English. *Ars* as Ovid uses it here goes back to the old translation of τέχνη, and ever afterwards remained in common use (τέχνη ῥητορική, *ars rhetorica*, τέχνη γραμματική,

ars grammatica, etc., then finally omitting τέχνη as no longer necessary, we have ἡ ῥητορική, rhetorica, rhetoric, ἡ γραμματική, grammatica, grammar, etc.). The same use of 'art' in English (the 'art of war', the 'art of horsemanship', the 'art of navigation', etc.) is old and perfectly well attested. In all three cases (τέχνη, ars, 'art') the word has nothing to do, *per se*, with a book. It simply means the set of rules, the system or regular method of making or doing the thing connoted by the adjective.

I observe a fairly abundant crop of typographical errors. But far be it from me to pull out the mote that is in my brother's eye. He has probably found them all by this time, and if so, I sympathize with his feelings.

One slight error of interpretation, however, I did notice which I take the liberty of pointing out. While discussing the Alba (p. 95), Dr. Schevill says that 'with the approach of day the lovers are naturally loath to separate, and blame the rising dawn for intruding upon them. Ovid puts it crudely: "no man cares to rise early except he who has no mistress"' (cp. p. 25, 'the poet remarks that early rising is borne cheerfully only by him who has no love').

The passage in question—Ovid is commenting on the hard lot of the spinning girls who have to rise at such an unearthly hour—is Amores, I, 13, 23-26:

Tu, cum feminei possint cessare labores,  
Lanificam revocas ad sua pensa manum.  
Omnia (not 'omni') perpeterer; sed surgere mane puellas,  
Quis, nisi cui non est ulla puella, ferat?

(That girls cease toiling sometimes, 'twere surely fair to ask.  
But no, you rouse the spinners each to her daily task.  
All else I might put up with; but who was ever known  
To make the girls rise early, who had one of his own?)

which is quite a different matter, besides being characteristically Ovidian, and anything but crude.

Of course, the modern commonplaces which the author attributes to the influence of Ovid were many of them ancient commonplaces as well, and there are some of them which even the writers with whom Dr. Schevill is concerned might have learned from other ancient sources. The idea, for instance, that love is a disease (pp. 26 and 58) is an old commonplace of ancient erotic literature which could have been derived from Tibullus (2, 5, 109-110, cp. 2, 4, 13-14; 4, 6, 17-18), or Horace (Odes, I, 27, 11), or Seneca (Epist. 39, 6), as well as from Ovid. The same may be said of the saga or witch (Tibullus I, 2, 42 ff. etc.), a familiar figure in the literature and in the everyday life of antiquity. The catalogue of her conventional feats is found in all departments of Roman



poetry, and it may be added that all these allusions are regularly cited as authority by the writers on magic, Remigius, Bodinus, de l'Ancre, le Loyer, Delrio, and others of their kind, from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century. So, too, the futility of magic, or as it is more usually stated, the comparative merits of beauty and magic in a love-affair, is—as I myself have shown in this Journal (A. J. P. XXXIV 62-73)—a question that appears as early as the *Andromache* of Euripides, and that afterwards turns up again and again in practically every department of ancient literature.

These and similar ideas, however, are especially prominent in Ovid, and besides, Ovid himself was especially prominent during the Renaissance. It may be, therefore, that, as Dr. Schevill concludes, it was he after all who in most cases was the real source. This point is well illustrated by the question of the relation of the *Albas* to *Amores*, I, 13, which has already been referred to above. So far as Ovid himself is concerned, this poem (his *Address to the Dawn*) is nothing more nor less than a rhetorical expansion of material already dealt with in epigrams of the Hellenistic period. A few of these epigrams still survive in the *Anthologia Palatina*. And, in fact, the real *Alba*, even in antiquity itself, was certainly nothing new. *Athenaeus*, 15. 697 B, actually quotes a *Locrian Alba*. Doubtless, it is neither old nor, strictly speaking, popular. But, at all events, it is older than the *Troubadours* by a thousand years, and the mere existence of it is enough in itself to suggest that even in ancient Greece there were popular prototypes of those epigrams of the second and third centuries B. C. which Ovid had before him. In the *Locrian song* both metre and language indicate that the speaker—a woman, or, rather, the woman—is nearly inarticulate from fright and excitement:

ὦ τί πάσχεις; μὴ προδῶς ἄμμ', ἱκετεύω.  
πρὶν καὶ μολεῖν κείνον, ἀνίστω, μὴ κακὸν  
μέγα ποιήσῃ σε κάμῃ τὴν δειλάκραν.  
ἄμέρα καὶ δῆ, τὸ φῶς διὰ τῆς θυρίδος οὐκ εἰσορῆς;

Oh gods, what do you! rise with speed!  
Before he comes, or ever you betray  
Yourself and me! indeed, indeed,  
I am so frightened! go, oh go, I pray!  
Look at the window! see, 'tis light, 'tis day!

Now, by way of comparison, let me subjoin a characteristic representative of the *Troubadour Albas*:

Quan lo rossinhols escria  
Ab sa par la nueg e'l dia  
Yeu suy ab ma bell' amia

Ios la flor,  
Tro la gaita de la tor  
Escria: 'drutz, al levar!  
Qu'ieu vey l'alba e'l iorn clar'.

Whilst the nightingale is crying  
To his mate, and night is flying,  
Then my love and I are lying  
In her bower,  
Till the watch cries from his tower:  
'Up, thou lover, and away!  
Lo, the Dawn, 'twill soon be day'!

It is a far cry from this genuinely Ovidian piece to the essentially modern tragedy of the Locrian song just quoted. In the case, then, of the Troubadour Albas, as so often elsewhere, we may well suspect that, whatever else was available, the initial suggestion, the supreme influence, was Ovid. And how much of the written word that brings joy to our lives he has inspired!

Dr. Schevill says at the close of his discussion (p. 233) that 'a more genuine psychology of our human relations and of the motives of our actions guided poets and novelists (after the middle of the seventeenth century); love and its manifestations became, in a sense, more reasonable because they were truer to real life, and more original in so far as the art of writing broke with practically every inherited classical tradition. In the change Ovid and his prestige were bound to vanish forever'.

I confess that, taking modern fiction as a whole, I am not as complacent as Dr. Schevill appears to be. So far, however, as his last sentence is concerned, I fear he is right. And when I consider the form and the content of most of the novels, and tales, and narrative poems that are dealt out to us from day to day, I could wish that, like our forefathers of the Renaissance, we only had wisdom enough to go back to the author of the *Metamorphoses*, the *Amores*, the *Heroides*, the *Ars Amatoria*, to sit at his feet, and again to learn from him as best we may what it is that makes a story immortal and always young.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

---

The Classical Papers of MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE. Columbia University Press, New York, 1912.

Perhaps the two younger classical scholars of the last twenty years whose careers seemed fullest of promise and who were most talked of by other scholars were H. W. Hayley of Harvard, and Mortimer Lamson Earle of Columbia.

They were friends and both died early, before reaching the full maturity of their powers, the former in 1900, the latter, Sept. 26, 1905. For a record of the life-work of Professor Earle, the volume of his "Classical Papers", we are indebted to the ties of affection—especially on the part of his devoted wife and of his cousin, Miss Caroline Allen Potter—and of friendship, as exhibited by a committee of his colleagues and intimates, Professors Knapp, Lodge, Perry, and Hirst. The latter undertook the task of collecting and editing the papers, and the whole makes a beautiful volume of nearly 300 pages, including, we are told in the Preface, with the exception of the three Greek plays he edited, the *Alcestis*, *Medea*, and *Oedipus Rex*, "practically everything left by Professor Earle, whether in papers already published or in manuscript ready for publication".

The collection is of much value, and scholars in many lands will be glad that friendship and love rescued and made accessible the fruits of the labor of this young professor who conferred distinction upon American scholarship. I have had the book on my desk for some months, reading from time to time nearly all that it contains and realizing, more completely even than when I knew and admired him in life, his remarkable acumen, his broad and sound scholarship, his extraordinary learning. I first met him at the Princeton meeting of the American Philological Association (1891), and read first his little paper on "*Antigone* 1204 sq." (1892); from that time I regarded him as one of our "coming men", and hailed the papers steadily appearing after that in various classical periodicals both at home and abroad. Before 1892 he seems to have published three papers in the *American Journal of Archaeology* and one in the *Classical Review*. The most important of these earlier papers, that on "*A Sikyonian Statue*", written when he was a member of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens and published in the *Journal of Archaeology* in 1889, is not only interesting reading, but shows wide study of the literature pertaining to the sculpture of the period. It has already the felicity of statement and thorough sanity and independence that characterized Earle in later years. One would get from this paper a favorable impression of the training given young Americans in the School at Athens.

From 1892 on each year brought forth from three to a dozen classical papers. I confidently expected to meet him at every session of the Philological Association, to hear a paper from him, and to find with him his faithful companion, who I believe missed only one meeting he ever attended. Of all these meetings, that at Schenectady in 1902 stands out most distinctly in my memory. He read there two papers, "*Studies*

in Sophocles' *Trachinians*", and "The Prologue of the *Agamemnon*", presenting by title a third, "Notes on Sophocles' *Antigone*". These papers made a fine impression; but a discussion of his—it may have been the substance of the first paper given in this form—won my admiration completely. He had written some Greek on a blackboard, and while talking looked steadily at the board, as if reading from it. But my eyes were far-sighted and still keen in those days, and I saw that the characters were merely a suggestive text, that while gazing forward he was really looking inward and reading from the tablets of his mind. It was the most remarkable exhibition that I remember of a convincing classical argument supported by a wealth of illustrations drawn without the aid of memoranda from a rich treasure-house of memory. Another little incident of the same meeting recurs to me. Professor Harry, in a paper, on the *Hippolytus* I think, had said that he would feel he had failed if he did not convince Professor Earle that he was right; but the latter, rising afterwards, first said courteously he was not convinced, then gave what seemed to me good reasons for his dissent. Evidently others also were impressed at that meeting, for I remember Professor Knapp saying "This is Earle's meeting; don't you think so?" And the Association thought so too; for he was elected Vice President, at thirty-six, and so started on the road to the presidency, the youngest man so honored in recent years. The paper on *Studies in Sophocles' Trachinians*,—with which this volume opens,—as I read it now, seems to me to justify all my enthusiasm of twelve years ago. I had noticed, as many have done, some of the resemblances between the *Trachinians* and the *Alcestis*, though most of the subtle reminiscences I had not observed at all, and when the paper was read at the Association I should probably have been inclined to regard Sophocles lender rather than borrower; but, if so, reading the paper now has changed my mind. Clearly 1902 was a year of plenty for Earle: besides the three papers mentioned above, I find published in that year two others on Sophocles (*Antigone* and *Electra*) one on Euripides' *Hippolytus*, two on Horace, one on Cicero, and one on the Greek Alphabet.

A glance at the table of contents of this volume shows that Earle's productiveness continued undiminished in the remaining three years of his life, for it credits him with eleven publications in 1903, eight in 1904, and twelve in 1905. In this last year he would naturally have reached the presidency of the American Philological Association, but that body wishing to confer an extraordinary honor on its incomparable secretary, who was retiring after some twenty years' loyal service, continued the two vice-presidents and jumped the secretary at once into chief place. Before the next meeting, in December

1905, Professor Earle, returning from a summer in Mediterranean countries, had fallen a victim to typhoid fever.

Prof. Earle's chief energies as a productive scholar were devoted to textual criticism; but there is evidence in these papers also of unusual gifts as an expositor or interpreter. In proof I would point—to use only two or three examples—first to the paper already mentioned, “Studies in the Trachiniae”; next perhaps to a little paper on “Trachiniae 26-48—A Study in Interpretation” (1895). This is an admirable piece of exposition, and shows at the same time his acumen as a conjecturer. Then there is the short paper on Hercules Furens 445 sqq., in which he differs with Prof. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, and proves his point, I think.

But admirable as his exposition is—and, comparatively speaking, there is not a great deal of this—it is not these papers, nor his longer general ones, whether on Greek Syntax or Lexicography or Archaeology, that will longest keep his memory alive. Future scholars that take the trouble to read his papers on “The Supplementary Signs of the Alphabet” will be impressed by his learning, though his conclusions may in some cases be superseded. But specialists on the Greek tragedians, Thucydides, Plato, Horace and Cicero—thanks especially to this volume—will continue to turn to his conjectures and find here a spirit akin to Musgrave and Cobet. Already in his twenty-eighth year he wrote to an English scholar, “Textual criticism is a thing toward which I find myself inclining more and more”. This tendency increased with the years, as seems natural when one considers his bent of mind and scholarly equipment. Professor Perry says “With the palaeography of Greek and Latin manuscripts, and with the labors of earlier scholars in editing and interpretation he had an extraordinary acquaintance, perhaps unmatched in this country”. His position in this line of work was recognized not only in America, as shown by Professor Gildersleeve's remark, “Prof. Earle has occupied an almost solitary eminence among American Hellenists as a conjectural critic”, but also in Europe. The range of his emendations and conjectures is very wide, including all the chief and many minor Greek authors. He discusses in Sophocles eighty passages in 80 pages; Euripides seventy-four passages in 35 pages; Aeschylus, eleven passages in 9 pages; Thucydides, ninety-nine passages in 17 pages; Plato, ninety-one passages—sometimes with several changes suggested in each—in 12 pages. To those authors his attention was chiefly directed, but miscellaneous notes occur elucidating or emending passages in Homer, Hesiod, Sappho, Pindar, Simonides, Bacchylides, Hippocrates, Herodotus, Aristophanes, Xenophon, Lysias, Isocrates, Isaeus, Demosthenes, Aristotle, Polybius, Plutarch, Josephus, Diodorus, Appian, Lucian, Pau-



sanas, Heliodorus. His attention was directed much less to Latin authors, the papers treating of these covering only 35 pages in this volume, and discussing passages in Horace, Cicero, Catullus, Virgil, Livy, Seneca, Statius.

Perhaps I may be pardoned for calling more especial attention to the paper in Latin contributed to the *American Journal of Philology* (1905) on Thucydides I, 1-23. In these twenty-three chapters Professor Earle proposes or defends ninety or more changes in the vulgate, and thinks some half dozen more desirable. It is not to be expected, of course, that one who was greatly influenced by the attitude of Professors Goodwin and White toward the text-criticism of Thucydides would be altogether satisfied with a paper like this on Thucydides' famous Introduction. Professor Goodwin used to say, on the proof-sheets of Thucydides VII, something like this "No doubt the Germans have made the text here clearer; but the question is, Did he write it so?" Judging from Earle's editions of Greek authors, e. g. the *Oedipus Rex*, he would have incorporated more of his own emendations in his text than any American has ever been bold enough to do, and I might not agree with him as to the majority of these; but my disagreement would not represent my respect for his acumen and his scholarship. While I am more conservative, I do not fail to recognize that just such work as this has given him standing among the world's classical scholars, who will, I hope and believe, keep turning to his conjectures in the never ending attempt to remedy the defects of copyists.

The editors have appended some of Earle's poems, as well as translations into English and into Greek. Of the former I should be proud to be the author of "Dawn in Achaia" or of "Euripides in Salamis"; and I wish I could be as well satisfied with his Greek rendering of Lincoln's immortal Gettysburg address as with that of Longfellow's "Evening Star".

Scholars who knew Professor Earle only in print will be glad, and not surprised, to learn from Professor Ashmore's Memoir, that "he was not only an author and a man of research; he was also a teacher of the first rank". I had long known this from one of my students who subsequently became a pupil of his, as well as from Professor Knapp, whom Earle probably influenced at least as much as he influenced any other man. It is good pupils that know best the merits of the good teacher. "He spared no effort", says the resolution of his Barnard pupils, "to kindle his own high ideals in each individual student under his care. And in return for this sympathy we gave him that peculiarly tender affection which springs from gratitude for wider outlook and personal inspiration".

A significant feature of his method as a teacher of graduate students, which indicates as well the breadth and thorough-

ness of his classical scholarship, was his habit in conducting the weekly meeting of the Greek Seminar at Columbia. This was mainly under his leadership during the last five years of his life, and he conducted it, according to the German custom, regularly in Latin. It is pleasant to learn that this custom was welcome to Columbia students, and attracted graduate students from elsewhere. He approved, too, the German requirement of writing classical theses for higher degrees only in Latin. Speaking Latin with ease, he wrote it fluently, and regularly couched in that language his contributions to *Mnemosyne* and the *Revue de Philologie*—except two which were in French. In general, it may be said, his equipment for the work of a classical scholar was extraordinary. He wrote and spoke his mother tongue not only with fluency and correctness, but with fastidious good taste. He had, it seems, excellent command of both German and French, as doubtless also of Italian, and he knew modern Greek well. And we all remember his beautiful hand-writing, in English as easy to read as type-writing, in Greek "more beautiful than Porson's", as an admiring scholar has said.

He was often despondent especially in his earlier years, it is said, and that was perhaps inevitable with his high ideals. And yet he was, as most of us see it, a happy man, and his an enviable career. Scholars on two continents knew and honored him; his pupils were proud of and devoted to him; and, best of all, he had "a rare genius for friendship". "To the writer", says Professor Ashmore, "he was both a friend and an inspiration". Finally, it is a comfort to know that the president of a great university knew how to appreciate the value of such a scholar. "Dr. Earle was", said President Butler, "of the type of scholar that no university can afford to be without, for it is a type to which scholarly ideals and scholarly standards are all in all".

CHARLES FORSTER SMITH.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

---

The Beneventan Script. A History of the South Italian Minuscule, by E. A. LOEW, PH. D., Research Associate of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. Oxford, at The Clarendon Press, 1914. Pp. xix, 384; nine facsimiles. \$6.75.

Dr. Loew gives us here what we expected of a brilliant and tireless observer, stimulated by the genius of Ludwig Traube, and aided by the generosity particularly of the Carnegie Institution and of James Loeb, which has enabled him to devote

many continuous years to a paleographic problem. During this period he found time to publish an incidental investigation (*Studia Palaeographica*, in the *Sitzungsberichte der kgl. Bayerischen Akademie d. Wissenschaften*, Munich, 1910), which clarified the whole subject of *i-alta* in MSS, and the differentiation of hard and soft *ti* in South Italy and Spain; and it is characteristic of the thoroughness of his work that this is the best exposition of the development of the Visigothic hand of Spain, and contains the best list of extant Visigothic MSS. With the help of a host of scholars—the mere mention of their names fills over two pages of the preface—he has now produced what we hope is the first of a series of masterpieces. Though supplemented by a separate volume of plates (*Scriptura Beneventana*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, ten guineas), it is complete in itself, as it contains several handsome facsimiles, excerpted from the larger collection; they are chosen to illustrate the development of the Beneventan from a hand not very different from the old Roman cursive to the wonderful calligraphy of the late eleventh century, and to the final collapse of the script, after five centuries of evolution, before the all-conquering minuscule of the North.

After a useful summary of the history of the Lombard duchies and of the part played by Monte Cassino in the transmission of the classics—we owe Varro, Tacitus' major works and Apuleius to those Benedictine monks—Loew attacks the question of the proper appellation for the script which found its home there. Here he displays special animus against the English term "Lombardic"—our current American name of "Lombard" is not even dignified with mention in the text—; but it is surely as appropriate as is Visigothic for the national hand of Spain; and Beneventan has the disadvantage, to a classical student, of calling up the city (not the duchy) of Beneventum, which is of infinitesimal importance as compared with Monte Cassino. To one who calls "French Lombard" by the phrase "the Corbie script" (or even another impossible to reproduce with ordinary typographical facilities), Cassinese should surely appeal as the scientific term to adopt. While very interesting, this is the least satisfactory part of the book, and it was a mistake to make it so prominent; but one must grant Dr. Loew this, that henceforth the hand will be called Beneventan. One of the most valuable and unexpected results of his study was to show that this hand was also used for centuries across the Adriatic, in Dalmatia and Istria, in the special rounded form known as the Bari type, of which a good example is Ehrle and Liebaert's plate 15. A map indicates the centers in which the Beneventan script was used. In the interesting sketch of the

development of the hand from the Roman cursive, Dr. Loew finds it necessary to take up in detail the theory that the Visigothic had a strong influence on the formation of the Beneventan, and is successful in showing that the resemblances of the two hands may be explained by their similar development from the cursive. He has found very little to indicate close relations between Spain and Southern Italy during the period when the two scripts were crystallizing. His statement on p. 101 of the characteristic abbreviations of Visigothic is rather too sweeping.

In his search for criteria which would aid in the dating of Beneventan MSS, Loew has discovered that final *r* has a short stem until the eleventh century, and that the final syllable *-tur* is differently abbreviated at different periods. I must confess, however, that I have found the ninth-century form of *-tur* in a Monte Cassino MS (no. 97) on a later page than the eleventh-century form—which merely confirms my innate skepticism of the possibility of *depending* upon such criteria. They are useful for incidental confirmation, but are treacherous, and quite unusable by a novice. In his chapter on abbreviations, Loew gives a summary of Traube's theory that contractions—*Pa.*, for instance—are derived from the Christian "*nomina sacra*", while suspensions—as *Penn.*—are of pagan origin; an alphabetical list of Beneventan abbreviations follows. This is most painstaking, and of high value; it is curious however how few characteristic abbreviations Beneventan has to show, as contrasted with Visigothic or Insular. Certain abbreviations which trouble Loew are Visigothic; such are *frr*, *mscdia* (*frater*, *misericordia*). Is not the *ñ* for *enim* (p. 180) merely the current late abbreviation?

The chapter on punctuation is epoch-making; it covers 50 pages, and will be indispensable to all students of paleography. The treatment of the interrogation sign is especially interesting, with his proof of the distinction between the nominal and predicate question in Visigothic and Beneventan; an incidental note proves what will surprise many, that the modern Spanish custom of setting a *¿* at the beginning of a question, dates from only about 1750; a champion of Visigothic influence upon Beneventan had stated that this custom, which modern Spain had preserved from the Visigothic hand, had later influenced Beneventan—all of which statements Loew shows to be incorrect. The marks used in the MSS are primarily guides to intonation, it appears; Loew has even found an assertion sign, used over the first word of the answer to a question. There is also a good discussion of syllabification, with full references. Orthography seems a little neglected; it is hard to believe that Beneventan MSS spell so regularly as *L.* would indicate. There is a full hand-list of extant MSS



in Beneventan—L. has found over 600 of them!—but one misses a list of facsimiles. No matter how incomplete, such a list is always useful. The book is full of incidental observations of value, like that proving that the place of the famous signature of 510 A. D. in the St. Peter's Hilary MS, can only be Karalis.

The book is sumptuously printed, with lavish use of special types; there is hardly a single misprint. It seems ungracious to find any fault with such a handsome volume; but students will wish that it had been compressed and less expensively printed, and thus made available at a reasonable price. Certainly a protest (*bello peracto!*) will arise from Continental scholars; though written in what is for most of them an unfamiliar and difficult language, they will find it indispensable; and after all, the ultimate purpose of any such book is the widest advancement of science—a purpose admirably fulfilled by the *matter* of Loew's volume. It is beyond compare the most important recent paleographic investigation in any language; and it is a satisfaction to record that its author, a graduate of Cornell and Halle, has been appointed the Sanders Reader in Paleography at Cambridge, and University Lecturer in Paleography at Oxford.

C. U. CLARK.

---

WERNER WILHELM JAEGER, NEMESIOS VON EMESA: Quellenforschungen zum Neuplatonismus und seinen Anfängen bei Poseidonios. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1914. Pp. xi + 148.

One declares that there is nothing new under the sun; another, that history is the record of great personalities, that is to say, of men of genius and originality. There is a modicum of truth in each of these contentions. The history of human thought may be compared to the *album*: if the historian would read it aright, he must distinguish in it the *edicta tralatitia* which those who sit in judgment on the *κύκλος γενέσεως* and the *orbis terrarum* and justify the ways of God to man accept from their predecessors and transmit to their successors, but must not fail also to discern those nuances in the interpretation of the *cause célèbre* which prove that the judges were men and not machines. It is not an uncommon occurrence that the members of a court agree in their conclusion while differing radically in the course of thought which leads to it. In the so-called dark ages of the human spirit the obscurity is due to our failure to distinguish the contribution of the individual.



Where distinctions vanish the  $\delta\upsilon\nu$  coincides with the  $\mu\eta\delta\upsilon\nu$ . Until recently there was hardly a period of active and well documented human thought so dark as that of the Graeco-Roman world between 100 B. C. and 300 A. D. In their general outlines the *edicta tralatitia* were easily discerned—the inheritance of Platonic, Aristotelian, Stoic, and Epicurean doctrines; but the principles and prepossessions which brought about the peculiar amalgamation of these ingredients, in other words, the mental physiognomy of the man whose personality enforced the *pax Romana* in the realm of the spirit, were quite lost to view. Out of the obscurity there has gradually emerged a figure of singular interest,—Posidonius. He is taking his place in the system of ἀρχαὶ καὶ πηγαί which constitutes the history of Greek thought. The typical representative of the Hellenists, collecting the pure fountains springing in the highlands of the Hellenic period and in the isolated peaks of his native Orient, he gave them forth tempered and blended to irrigate the quiet gardens of the plain.

Among the number of scholars who have endeavored to recover the personality of Posidonius, perhaps none has rendered a more important service than Dr. Jaeger in his recent book, *Nemesios von Emesa: Quellenforschungen zum Neuplatonismus und seinen Anfängen bei Poseidonios*. To be sure, the indispensable thing, the thing at present most urgently demanded, still remains to be done. In the philological literature of the last quarter century there are scattered countless observations and suggestions bearing on Posidonius. These must be collected and sifted. Beginning with properly attested opinions of Posidonius and combining with them and with one another such other data as the most rigorous philological and historical method shall yield, the scholar who undertakes the difficult but fruitful task will render a service second to none. At present Quellenforschung in this field is in danger of ascribing everything to Posidonius. Dr. Jaeger possesses the requisite enthusiasm and can doubtless school himself to exercise the necessary critical discrimination. If he should undertake the task many, who in the present state of the inquiry hesitate to publish their suggestions, would doubtless be pleased to present them for his consideration. Dr. Jaeger's book falls into two parts. Part I. *Galen's Wissenschaftslehre und der ältere Neuplatonismus*, is a notable contribution to our knowledge of the later doxographic tradition. What Diels in his *Doxographi Graeci* called the *Vetusta Placita*, and has since called the *Posidonian Placita*, is now more clearly than ever defined by the researches of Dr. Jaeger, and shown to be connected with Posidonius' commentary on the *Timaeus*. We obtain also a clearer view of a number of pagan and Christian epitomes of it, and in particular of Galen's important work,

Περὶ ἀποδείξεως. In this part there is hardly anything which the present writer would call in question. Part II. *Die Weltanschauung des Poseidonios bei Nemesios*, is not quite so satisfactory, and one cannot dispel the fear that much is credited specifically to Posidonius which was the common property of his age. Surely the tendency of Posidonius to harmonize conflicting views was not peculiar to him, but was the characteristic of his age, which was highly impressionable, but not singularly original. Much also which Dr. Jaeger takes for mystic fervor and the ecstatic vision of the Orphics is probably to be set down as nothing but rhetorical imitation of Plato τοῦ πάντα σεμνύνοντος.

Dr. Jaeger sometimes fails to see the connection of specific doctrines, which he attributes to Posidonius, with those of his predecessors. Thus when Philo (p. 111) speaks of earth being mixed with water, ἵνα ὡς ἂν ὑπὸ δεσμοῦ συνέχῃται (ἡ γῆ), we must note that water is regarded by Aristotle, Hippocrates, and Empedocles as a sort of glue. Late authors interpreted the Empedoclean Φιλότης as water because of its glutinative powers, and even the figure of the δεσμός may have occurred in Empedocles. Diels' brilliant emendation yields the text δύνω δέει ἄρθρον in fr. 32; and though we do not know the context of thought, it is altogether likely that Empedocles was referring either to Φιλότης or to ὕδωρ. Indeed, the Empedoclean Φιλότης is certainly the most important classical antecedent of Posidonius' theory of the δεσμός; for only when Φιλότης unites without destroying the warring elements does a κόσμος arise. Basilus clearly alluded to Empedocles in that connection. In other instances our author too hastily or with too little explanation concludes to sources, as when he declares (p. 109) that Heraclitus' harmony of the bow and the lyre was derived from the musical researches of Pythagoras. To make this obvious or probable would seem to require some explanation of παλίντροπος and τόξον.

W. A. HEIDEL.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.

## REPORTS.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, XXXV (1911).

Pp. 5-14. Louis Havet, Virgile, *Enéide* 8, 65. The text of the passage, as we now have it, is: "Hic mihi (the Thybris speaks) magna domus celsis caput urbibus exit". The explanations given by the commentators are inadequate. "Hic" is on this spot, the site of the later Ostia, not at Rome, nor at a hypothetical Laurentum, nor at Lanuvium, nor at Ardea, nor at Lavinium. "Magna domus" refers to a temple that was to be erected by Aeneas, which Virgil identified with the temple that actually stood on the site in question, and the cella of which was two centuries later restored by Lucilius Gamala (CIL. XIV, 376, 16-17). "Caput" is the seat of a future confederation. By "celsis urbibus" is meant the towns up-stream that are to compose this confederation. "Exit" is probably a very ancient error for *escit* (= *erit*), which form occurs in the Twelve Tables, Ennius (*superescit*), and Lucretius (1, 619).

Pp. 15-17. Jean Maspero, Le titre d' "Apellôn" dans Jean de Nikiou. The term "apellôn" in chapters CVII and CVIII is a corruption of the Ethiopian transliteration of the word *τριβούνος*.

Pp. 18-27. Georges Lafaye, Lucilius, III, ITER SICULUM (MARX). The description of the road in verse 109 does not fit the Via Popilia. Vv. 107-108 seem to show that a friend (perhaps Sp. Mummius), who owned an estate 250 miles from Capua, had invited Lucilius to visit him at his villa, and had given him the directions comprised in vv. 98-108. For the corrupt "tlanus" of v. 117, the author suggests "nanus". V. 124 should be restored so as to read "ad portam mille a portu est exinde Salerni, i. e., "It is a mile from the landing to the gate of Salernum". In v. 131 read "student hi ligna videre" with Lachmann and Baehrens. V. 140 sq. read "Tantalus, qui poenas ob facta nefantia *pronus* | pendit.

Pp. 28-33. Georges Romain, Sur l'emploi de l'infinitif d'exclamation chez Plaute et chez Térence. The exclamatory infinitive occurs 20 times in Plautus, and 40 times in Terence. The leading word is regularly provided with the interrogative particle, the particle being omitted only under certain well-defined conditions. The author makes use of his observa-

tions in the critical treatment of a few passages of Terence's Phormio; viz., 501-503, 525-528, 709-710, 882-884.

Pp. 34-39. Adolphe J. Reinach, A propos de l'himation d'Alkiménès de Sybaris. The author rejects M. Dugas' explanation (BCH. 1910, 116-121) of Ps.-Aristot., De Mir. Ausc. 838a 22 sq.: ἐκατέρωθεν δὲ διείληπτο ζῳδίοις ἐνυφασμένοις, ἄνωθεν μὲν Σούσοις, κάτωθεν δὲ Πέρσαις; shows that ζῳδία means not "figures in general" but "figures of men or of beasts"; adopts Heyne's correction Σουσίους for Σούσοις, and translates with him "imagines Susiorum ac Persarum"; gives archaeological proof of the ethnological differences between Susians and Persians; and suggests that the ἱμάτιον in question was manufactured in Miletus about 530 B. C., Miletus being connected with Sybaris by the strongest ties of friendship.

Pp. 40-55. A. Bourgery, Les lettres à Lucilius sont-elles de vraies lettres? The author marshals the chief arguments that have been advanced in favor of the theory that the letters of Seneca do not constitute any real correspondence but were minor discussions, which Seneca found it most convenient to publish in epistolary form. The letters of Epicurus served as models, and as Epicurus immortalized the name of Idomeneus, so Seneca wished to hand down to posterity the name of Lucilius. Though investigation has shown that the letters are grouped in chronological order, and that none of them was written before the year 62 A. D., yet it is impossible to fix the exact dates of the individual letters. The references to the season or to the state of the weather are apt to be fictitious, the argument ex silentio is worth little or nothing, and supreme indifference to facts is characteristic of Seneca. The letters may, however, be divided into the following groups: 1. The first 29, which are characterized by their brevity, and the presence of a note of enthusiasm for Epicurus. These were written in a few days, probably in Dec. 62 or 63 A. D. 2. Letters 30-48, which were written shortly after the first group. None of these letters exceed five pages (ed. Hense) in length. 3. The Campanian letters (49-87). Some of these are rather long, running as high as fifteen pages. 4. The letters written at Rome or in the neighborhood of Rome (88-124). Some of these are veritable treatises, though others are very brief.

Pp. 56-70. Louis Mariès, Aurions-nous le commentaire sur les Psaumes de Diodore de Tarse? M. Jules Lebreton had commenced an edition of MS Coisl. 275, which bears the title, Ὑπόθεσις καὶ ἐρμηνεία τοῦ ψαλτηρίου τῶν ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα ψαλμῶν ἀπὸ φωνῆς Ἀναστασίου μητροπολίτου Νικαίας. After having transcribed about forty folios, he was obliged to give up the undertaking and passed it on to the author of this paper.

M. Mariès completed the transcription and, in the course of his investigation of the literary connections and the tradition of the MS, he found that it contained all the fragments of Diodorus of Tarsus, 56 in number, that are found in the Paris "Catena" MSS gr. 139 (148), 140 (141, 163), and Coisl. 80. The average length of the fragments is from four to twelve lines, and some of the fragments are very much longer. The range of the psalms that are commented on extends from psalm 1 to psalm 89. As the commentary of our MS (Coisl. 275) is homogeneous, and the fragments in question fit the context perfectly, the author has reached the conclusion that there is evidence enough to justify him in raising the question as to whether the whole commentary is not the work of Diodorus of Tarsus.

Pp. 71-74. D. Serruys, ΑΠΟ ΦΩΝΗΣ. The discussion is apropos of the phrase ἀπὸ φωνῆς, which occurs in the title of the commentary that formed the subject of the previous article. Serruys finds that the phrase in question does not refer to the mere dictation of an original work, as Du Cange and the Thesaurus maintain, but that it always implies some modification of the original, whether the modified form be an outline, expansion, adaptation, paraphrase, collection of extracts, or what not.

Pp. 75-88. L. Laurand, Les fins d'hexamètre dans les discours de Cicéron. The author presents a list and an analysis of all the heroic clausulae that are found at the end of the sentence in the speeches of Cicero. He shows that these clausulae are not nearly so rare as has been thought. It would therefore be a serious mistake to try to do away with all of them by emendation. In dealing with this question one must bear in mind that under certain circumstances these clausulae are unavoidable. To be sure, the clausulae favored by Cicero are very few in number. But the orator does not always display the same skill in the handling of his rhythms. In his youth, Cicero is not the master that he was in his maturer years. Moreover, the care devoted to rhythmical clausulae, as to the other elements of style, varies with the character of the speech, the various divisions of the speech, and even with the tone of the individual sentence.

Pp. 89-94. J. Marouzeau, Note complémentaire sur l'emploi du participe présent latin. In a previous essay (Paris, Champion, 1910), the author had presented the results of a study of the use of the present participle in the continuous texts of the republican period. In the present paper the author shows that the ISS and the fragments serve to confirm the conclusion announced in his former article, viz., that the employment of the present participle is more frequent and more varied in propor-



tion as the author deviates from current usage and adopts a more learned style.

Pp. 95-122. Bulletin bibliographique.

Pp. 123-139. A. S. Arvanitopoulos, *Inscriptions inédites de Thessalie*. Continuation of the author's publication of new Thessalian inscriptions. Nos. 1-25 of these appeared in the *Ἀρχαιολογικὴ Ἐφημερίς*. The present instalment comprises Nos. 26-37. 26. Archaizing IS, 1st cent. B. C., 6 lines. Note *Δαμμάτηρ* (with two *μ*'s); *λειτορεύσανσα* = *ιερωτεύσανσα*; *πετροετηρίς* = *τετραετηρίς*. 27. Agonistic IS, time of Sulla, 17 lines. Note the first appearance of *Κλειτόριος* in Thessalian ISS, and the new name *Ἀλκοίτας*. 31. Dedicatory IS to Zeus *Περφερέτας*, 1st cent. B. C. 33. Ν]ικοδῖκα γυνὰ | *Κλεαρχεία*, 3d or 4th cent. B. C. Note use of proper adj. for the genitive. 36. IS of 133 lines in two columns. Record of vineyards and other land purchased by the city of Homolion. The author assigns the IS to the 3d cent. B. C. It is composed in the *κοινή*. Noteworthy is the use of the sign Π for 1000, which has hitherto been found only in the ISS of Priene and Didyma, and in the Elephantine Papyri.

Pp. 140-143. Camille Jullian, *Les énigmes historiques de Lectoure sous l'empire romain*. Suggestion that Lactora was once upon a time the seat of a sacerdotal kingship, and that, owing to its fidelity to the Roman people, it for a long time formed a distinct district managed by an imperial procurator. (The grandfather of Piso Aquitanus, cf. *Caes. B. G. 4, 12, 4*, may have been the king of *Ἰοντώρα*, cf. *Diodor. XXXIV-XXXV, 36*. The author identifies *Ἰοντώρα* with Lactora.)

Pp. 144-178. Philippe Fabia, *La mère de Néron—à propos d'un plaidoyer pour Agrippine*. In an article entitled "Néron," which appeared in the *Revue de Paris*, 1906, M. Guglielmo Ferrero set up an elaborate defence of Agrippina, the mother of Nero. The present article contains a rebuttal of his arguments and a rectification of some of his statements. Ferrero had expressed surprise that for so many centuries people had read Tacitus without noticing the "incredible improbabilities, absurdities and contradictions with which his works abound," and he felt aggrieved that the history of the first century of the empire was still written after this "romancer, whose lack of critical spirit is hardly surpassed by his literary ability". Whilst admitting that Tacitus is not an ideal historian, Fabia rejects the crushing criticism of Ferrero. He shows that Ferrero has not read Tacitus either often enough or carefully enough, and that the faults with which he charges Tacitus are really Ferrero's own. "Careless disregard of tradition", Fabia goes on to say, "and a mania for the paradox have nothing in common with a critical spirit, and the history of the first century of the empire, such as it is told by Tacitus,

and above all as it is told after him and revised by the help of other testimony, is much more likely to be true than Ferrero's 'Néron', in which free rein is given to fancy and imagination".

Pp. 179-182. Bernard Haussoullier, ΠΡΟΗΝΕΜΟΣ ΠΑΡΑΣΤΑΣ, ΠΡΟΗΝΕΜΙΔΕΣ ΘΥΡΑΙ. In a recent discussion (BCH., 1910, 501-504), M. F. Courby identified the expression προηνεμίδες θύραι, which occurs several times in the ISS of Delos, as the doors of the pronaos and of the opisthodomos of the temple. Haussoullier, who praises Courby's work very highly, calls attention to the two occurrences of the word προήνεμος, which were unknown to Courby, in an IS relating to the temple of Apollo at Didyma. The expression προήνεμος παραστάς, as Haussoullier had pointed out in Rev. de Phil. 1905, p. 260, refers to the east façade of the naos. H. also adduces two other instances of προήνεμος from the ISS published by Wiegand in his Bericht ueber Milet und Didyma, Abh. BAKW., 1911.

Pp. 183-193. Édouard Cuq, Une fondation en faveur de la ville de Delphes en 315 de notre ère. Reproduction and discussion of the text of the Delphic IS regarding the amendment of the terms of a gift that had been made by Lucius Gellius Menogenes and his wife. I. With μυριάδων ἑκατὸν ἀπλῶν supply δηναρίων or ἀργυρίον δραχμῶν. ἀπλοῦς means "pure", "not debased", and corresponds to the Latin "probus". II. πεντήκοντα μυριάδας σινπληρίας probably represents the simple "summa legitima" (cf. the Latin "simplaria" venditio, "simpla" pecunia), which the law compelled the donor to pay in consequence of his election to the office of president of the δαμιουργοί, as opposed to the "duplicata", "multiplicata", or "ampliata" pecunia. III. In εἰς τὴν λουῖσιν τῶν βαλανείων, λουῖσις means the privilege of bathing with the necessary accessories. (Cf. lavatio, lavacrum in ISS and Dig.) IV. The senate and the donor's wife are appointed trustees for a year, with the proviso that the sum donated be placed on deposit with the city's banker. As the trust was created in perpetuity, the management of the trust was automatically renewed from year to year. V. The amended terms of the gift were ratified by the δαμιουργοί, a board upon whom devolved the execution of the council's acts relating to the city's financial affairs.

Pp. 194-202. D. Serruys, Une source gnostique de l'Apocalypse de Paul. The original text of the Apocalypse of Paul has been lost. The Greek text that we now have has undergone abridgments and revisions that show the influence of doctrinal considerations. The Latin and other versions also are not faithful renderings of the original. Nevertheless, a comparison of the various versions, and more particularly

of the Greek and of the principal Latin version, shows that the original was a compilation of a number of apocalyptic writings, one of which was a gnostic apocalypse that was current in Naasene circles.

Pp. 203-204. H. Alline, Sur un passage de Psellos relatif au *Phèdre*. A text of Psellos published in *Hermes*, XXXIV, 316-319, is emended at lines 17 and 90 sq.

Pp. 205-215. J. Marouzeau, Sur l'ordre des mots. The first part of the paper is a study of the artistic effect of the separation of the attributive adjective from its substantive. This separation serves to heighten the logical, descriptive, or aesthetic value of the epithet. When used by a good poet, like Virgil, the device is a most valuable aesthetic aid, whilst in the hands of a poor poet, it becomes a vulgar and wearisome artifice, which serves only to betray the writer's poverty of thought. The second part of the paper discusses the Latin order of words in relation to the question of translation. The writer denies that in Latin the order of words reflects the exact train of thought of the speaker or writer. The Roman makes use of the freedom permitted in the order of words to produce effects that are obtained by entirely different means in languages that have a fixed order of words.

P. 215. B. H., Epigraphica. χίλια ζεύγη in IG. II, 176 does not mean "a thousand yoke of oxen," but "the equivalent of the amount of work that a thousand yoke of oxen perform in a day."

Pp. 216-230. Bulletin Bibliographique.

Pp. 231-253. L. Delaruelle, Études critiques sur le texte du *de Divinatione*. In the first part of the paper the author emends *De Div.* II, 29; 145; 10; I, 36; 97; 115, and tells us that transpositions similar to those that M. Havet discovered in the *Cato Maior*, have taken place also in the *De Div.* The amount of the text transposed is equal in every case to one or two lines of the leaf of the *Tusc. Disp.* published by Clark in the *Mélanges Chatelain*. Hence the conclusion that the transposed groups represent one or two lines of an archetype that were first overlooked by a copyist, then replaced in the margin of the copy, and finally inserted at the wrong place in the body of the text. The second part of the paper presents a critical treatment of various other passages of the *De Div.*, viz., I, 6-7; 39; 96; II, 12-13; 36; 113; 124.

P. 254. Charles Picard, Note sur une inscription de Thasos. In IG. XII, 8, 269, line 8 sq. read [ἐκασ]τον instead of [αὐ]τὸν.

Pp. 255-275. A. Delatte, La lettre de Lysis à Hipparque. Study of a letter ascribed by tradition to the Pythagorean philosopher Lysis of Thebes and addressed to the Pythagorean

Hipparchus. There is a double tradition of the letter. The first form, designated as A, is found in Jamblichus' Life of Pythagoras, §§ 75-78, and goes back to Timaeus. The second form, designated as B, is presented by certain MSS upon which Hercher based his text of the letter in his *Epistolographi Graeci*. Diogenes Laertius (VIII, 42) appears to have known a modified form of B. After a detailed study of the first form of the letter, the author reaches the conclusion that there is nothing about the letter that would militate against its authenticity. Unfortunately, the only positive authority that can be adduced in support of the traditional ascription is the historian Timaeus. But the authority of Timaeus is not conclusive on this point, as he may have found the letter in some collection of Pythagorean documents without suspecting its authenticity. However, though the letter may not be genuine, it certainly originated in a Pythagorean circle of the fourth century, and it constitutes an important historical document. Form B shows a different introduction from that of form A, and, besides, it refers to certain *ὑπομνήματα* of which A knows nothing. These *ὑπομνήματα* are said to have been entrusted by Pythagoras to his daughter Damo, and later to have passed into the possession of his granddaughter Bitale. Delatte thinks that perhaps the author of the Ps.-Pythagorean treatises entitled *παιδευτικόν*, *πολιτικόν*, and *φυσικόν*, which belong to the second or to the first century B. C., modified the letter of Lysis and used it as an introduction to his treatises.

Pp. 276-281. H. de La Ville de Mirmont, *Les fabulae* de Statorius Victor. The *fabulae* of Statorius Victor that are mentioned by Seneca, *Suas.* 2, 18, were not fables but tragedies. At the time of the elder Seneca, *fabula* had not yet become the synonym of *apologus*. Though *fabella* and *fabula* are used also of a story or an anecdote, the term *fabula* is principally used of a dramatic composition. Hence, it would seem that Statorius Victor deserves a place equally with Balbus and Seneca in the *Index Poetarum* at the end of Ribbeck's *Tragicorum Fragmenta*.

Pp. 282-305. A. S. Arvanitopoulos, *Inscriptions inédites de Thessalie*. (Continuation from pp. 123-139 above.) Nos. 38-50. 38. *Δαμόκκας*. This is a pet name for *Δαμοκράτης*. 40. Fairly well-preserved IS of 37 lines from Thaumakoi. 1st cent. B. C. Records of enfranchisement. In addition to other interesting details, this IS furnishes important information in regard to a number of *strategi* of the Thessalian confederacy, and enables the author to revise the list of *strategi* given in IG. IX, 2, xxiv-xxv. It also presents the names of four hitherto unknown months of Thaumakoi, and records a number of new proper names. 41 and 41a. ISS of 23 and 25 lines respectively. There are many lacunae. The subject is the arbi-



tration of a boundary dispute between Ἀγγελαί and Κτιμένη. The ISS yield the highly interesting information of the existence of the cult of Omphale among the Dolopians. 43. Ἀντικράτεια Κλιοδαμεία γυνά. Ὁ[σ]ιον. Δίκαιον. Κλιοδαμεία γυνά = γυνὰ Κλιοδάμων. Note the formula ὅσιον, δίκαιον, of which this is the first occurrence. 48. First mention of a gymnasiarch among the Magnetes. 49. Θ]έμιδι ἀ[γ]ο | ραίαι. First half of the 5th cent. B. C. 50. Curious fragmentary IS from Pharsalos. 4th cent. B. C. The letters of the first four lines are enclosed in rectangles resulting from horizontal and vertical ruling. The IS furnishes the first mention of Thetis in Thesalian ISS. Note also the use of the strange participle καδικεύοντες, which the author connects with κάδδixος and κάδδix. Several addenda and corrigenda to ISS 26-37 are here appended.

Pp. 306-307. Louis Havet, *Lucrèce* 6, 1132. For "iam pigris calantibus" read "lanigeris palantibus".

Pp. 308-313. Bulletin bibliographique.

Pp. 315-329. D. Serruys, *Fragments de Stobée*. Serruys has presented a description, discussion, and complete collation of a hitherto unused MS of a few pages of Stobaeus, viz., folios 126 verso, 121, 122 and 120 of Parisinus gr. 3012. He shows that the principal source of the text of this MS goes back to a tradition that was independent of the common archetype of all the other MSS. At a given point of time, this independent tradition, which is here designated as Y, was contaminated by means of a MS of the type A + A'. Furthermore, even the common source of Y and of the archetype of our hitherto used MSS had undergone serious changes, as is evidenced by the number of *cruces* for which the text of our new MS affords no remedy. But despite these changes, this common source was greatly superior to the lacunose, corrupt, and arbitrarily touched up copy from which our hitherto used MSS are derived.

Pp. 330-336. Salomon Reinach, *Sur deux passages de Lucain*. In Lucan, 7, 28, Reinach proposes to read, "Di similes (for unde pares) somnos populis noctemque beatam!" At verse 43, he defends the text, "O miseri, quorum gemitus edere dolorem".

Pp. 336-337. J. E. Harry, *Euripide, Iphigenia in Tauris*, 96-103. In verse 98, read ἐκβησόμεσθ'; ἀποσμένων (sc. κληθρων) μάθοιμεν ἄν.

Pp. 338-346. ΝΙΚΟΣ Α. ΒΕΗΣ, *Quelques manuscrits grecs*. Description of several new MSS. I. Two new MSS of Sophocles discovered by the author in 1904. The most important of the two is MS 64 of the library of the monastery of Mega-



spelaeon at Kalavryta. This MS contains the Ajax and the Electra of Sophocles and the Hecuba and the Orestes of Euripides. The marginal scholia agree with our published scholia. The MS was written in the 15th century. The other MS of Sophocles is No. 161 of *Bélys'* reclassified MSS of Megaspelaeon. Besides an anonymous paraenetic work, it contains the Hecuba and the Orestes of Euripides, Fragments of the Anthology of Manuel Chrysoloras, Sophocles' Ajax, Extracts from Moeris, and Hesiod's Works and Days. This MS belongs to the 18th century. II. MS of Stephanos of Byzantium, dating from the 14th or the beginning of the 15th century, and belonging to the public library of Zakynthos. There is a lacuna between *κελαίθρα* and *κόρακες*. III. MS of the Biblical Commentary of Theodoretos of Kyrrhos, belonging to the library of Andritsaena in Olympia, and dated 1552 A. D. This MS was written by Constantine Palaeocappa. It contains only the commentary on Genesis and Exodus. MS 1050 of the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris seems to be the continuation of our MS.

Pp. 347-348. Édouard Cuq, Addendum ad Rev. de Phil. XXXV, 1911, 183-193. Results of a new examination by Bourguet of the IS in question.

Pp. 349-370. Bulletin bibliographique.

The following supplementary publications are appended:

Revue des Revues et Publications d'Académies relatives à l'antiquité classique. Fascicules publiés en 1910. 241 pp.

Revue des Comptes rendus d'ouvrages relatifs à l'antiquité classique. 1<sup>re</sup> année. Comptes rendus parus en 1910. 93 pp.

C. W. E. MILLER.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

ROMANIA, Vol. XLII (1913).

Janvier.

C. R. Borland et R. L. G. Ritchie. Fragments d'une traduction française en vers de la Chronique en Prose de Guillaume Le Breton. 22 pages. Miss C. R. Borland in cataloguing the Laing collection in the library of the University of Edinburgh recently came across two vellum leaves evidently recovered from an old binding. The manuscript to which they belonged was probably copied in France towards the year 1380. Various notes on the margins give clues to the manuscript's history on English soil. The original French work was written between

1216 and 1220, and was one of the treatises utilized by Vincent of Beauvais in his *Speculum Historiale*. The versification here preserved in fragmentary form was probably due to the pen of Jehan de Prunai, who composed it about the year 1227.

Albert Dauzat. Notes sur la palatalisation des consonnes. 11 pages. This study of palatalization in the Romance languages seeks to establish two new principles, which the author formulates as follows:

La palatalisation est susceptible d'acquérir ou de conserver plus d'intensité devant une voyelle tonique que devant une voyelle atone;

Dans tout groupe palatal, l'élément occlusif sonore a moins de résistance que l'élément occlusif sourd correspondant.

It is a remarkable fact that the numerous examples of consonantal palatalization in the Romance languages were produced exclusively during two periods separated from each other by a considerable time.

Amos Parducci. La Istoria di Susanna e Daniello, poemetto popolare italiano antico. 42 pages. The author publishes a critical edition based on the texts printed during a century or more after 1490 A. D., there being no manuscript of the poem known. The original composition of the poem must, however, be placed much earlier, and it is probably to be assigned to the region about Siena or Arezzo. The poem itself is anonymous, but it may perhaps be assigned to Niccolò Cieco d'Arezzo, who died some time after 1410.

Mélanges. C. De Boer, Sur un fragment publié de l'Ovide moralisé. A. Jeanroy, Prov. Far col e cais. A. Thomas, Le De claustro anime et le Roman de Troie. A. Thomas, A propos de Jehan de Brie. A. Thomas, Sur la date de la chute du D intervocalique an Gaule.

Comptes rendus. Le Roman de Troie, par Benoit de Sainte-Maure, p. p. Léopold Constans ("Avec le texte du roman de Thèbes, dû également à ses soins, . . . la critique entre en possession d'éléments capitaux pour l'histoire du roman français au moyen âge . . . M. Constans a attaché son nom à deux des œuvres historiquement les plus importantes de notre littérature médiévale: il faut l'en féliciter".—Edmond Faral). Alfons Hilka und Werner Söderhjelm, Petri Alfonsi Disciplina Clericalis (Lucien Foulet et M. R.). A. Jeanroy et J.-J. Salverda de Grave, Poésies de Uc de Saint-Circ (Giulio Bertoni). Duc de la Salle de Rochemaure, Les Troubadours cantaliens, XII<sup>e</sup>-XX<sup>e</sup> siècles (A. Jeanroy). René Lavaud, Les Troubadours cantaliens, XII<sup>e</sup>-XIX<sup>e</sup> siècles (A. Jeanroy). F. Novati, Contributo alla storia della lirica musicale italiana popolareggiante dei sec. XV, XVI, XVII (G. Bertoni). Charles Oulmont, La poésie morale, politique

et dramatique à la veille de la Renaissance: Pierre Gringore; Etude sur la langue de Pierre Gringore (Henri Chatelain). Mildred K. Pope and Eleanor C. Lodge, *Life of The Black Prince* (P. M.).

Correspondance. A. C. Ott, de Stuttgart, le 1<sup>er</sup> décembre, 1912; A. Långfors, de Helsingfors. décembre, 1912. E. Veÿ; Jules Ronjat.

Périodiques. Časopis pro moderni filologii, 1 (M. R.). Giornale Storico della Letteratura italiana, t. XXXVI-XLII (A. Linden records a notice, by Rostagno, of M. P. Brush, *The Isopo Laurenziano*). Revista pentru istorie, archeologie și filologie, X-XII (M. R.). Studi glottologici italiani, VI (M. R.). Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XXXV, 4-6, XXXVI, 1 (F. Rechnitz, St. Stroński et M. R.).

Chronique. Obituary notice of Alphonse Bos. French MSS at Wollaton Hall, Nottinghamshire (fragment of a fable by Marie de France). Publications annoncées. Collections et publications en cours.

Comptes rendus sommaires. 29 titles. Percival Bradshaw Fay, *Elliptical partitiv usage in affirmativ clauses in French prose of the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries* (H. Yvon). Aucassin et Nicolette, édité par G. Tournoux ("jolie curiosité typographique"). Carl Zipperling, *Das altfranzösische Fabel du vilain mire* (A. Långfors).

Avril.

Giulio Bertoni. Denominazioni del "Ramarro" (*Iacerta viridis*) in Italia. 13 pages. A dialectical and etymological investigation abounding in minute details.

Am. Pagès. Poésies catalanes inédites du ms. 377 de Carpentras. 30 pages. 1. Conte d'amour. This poem was composed towards the end of the fourteenth century. It begins somewhat in the manner of the *Lanval* of Marie de France, and gives both a physical and a moral portrait of the lady, in the midst of which the poem suddenly breaks off. 2. Chansons en l'honneur du sacré-cœur de Jésus. These poems are dedicated to Cardinal Jacme d'Aragon, which fact places their date between the years 1387 and 1392. They are based largely on Provençal tradition, and are a curious attempt to adapt the latter to a religious subject.

Louis Brandin. *Le livre de preuve*. 51 pages. The author of the French text does not mention his own name; but he gives his poem as a translation of a Latin work composed at Pampelune by an illustrious astronomer named "Rîgaus". The editor attempts to identify this unknown author with a Jewish astronomer of the eleventh century, whose works

were well-known in Spain. As an appendix there is published a similar Latin text from a Paris manuscript.

Mélanges. O. Bloch, Notes de lexicographie lorraine et franc-comtoise: 1. Grief et ses dérivés. 2. \*Novelaison. A. Jeanroy, A propos d'une récente édition de Folquet de Marseille. M. Esposito, Prière anglo-normande en quatrains. Henri Chatelain, Notes sur le Mistere de Saint Adrien. A. Thomas, Un manuscrit perdu du Roman du comte d'Anjou.

Comptes rendus. W.-N. Bolderston, La vie de saint Remi par Richier (Emmanuel Philipot). Arthur C. L. Brown, On the Independent Character of the Welsh Owain (A. G. van Hamel). W. Foerster, Wilhelm von England (A. Smirnov). Jules Gilliéron et Mario Roques, Etudes de Géographie linguistique (Albert Dauzat). Kr. Nyrop, Grammaire historique de la langue française, t. 4 (Lucien Foulet).

Périodiques. Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen, CXXII-CXXVII ("A. Tacke, Eine 'Rettung' der Marie de France. Corrige une erreur de M. Warnke, éditeur des œuvres de Marie de France, et commente la fable du lion qui va à la chasse avec la chèvre et le mouton. Dans une note additionnelle M. H. Morf discute l'identification, récemment proposée de la poétesse avec Marie, abbesse de Shaftesbury".—Arthur Långfors). Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, 13<sup>e</sup> année (Lucien Foulet). Répertoire d'art et d'archéologie (M. R.). Revue des Langues romanes, t. LIII-LV (Lucien Foulet). Revue de Philologie française et de littérature, t. XXVI (H. Yvon).

Chronique. Obituary notices of Honoré Champion and Carl Wahlund. Publications annoncées: Table de la Romania, t. XXXI-XL, par Lucien Foulet. Collections et publications en cours: Analysis of the Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, nos. 1-20.

Comptes rendus sommaires. 15 titles. The Enueg by Raymond Thompson Hill ("Le sujet est intéressant et nouveau".—A. Jeanroy).

Juillet.

Lucien Foulet. Le poème de Richeut et le Roman de Renard. 10 pages. Doubts are expressed as to the correctness of the commonly assumed early date, and the supposed historical allusions are discussed at some length.

Ernest Langlois. La traduction de Boèce par Jean de Meun. 39 pages. There have been preserved to us in manuscripts now in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris eight translations of Boëthius, De Consolatione Philosophiae, in at least forty-seven manuscripts. To these must, of course, be added

many manuscripts in other libraries. Two of the translations mentioned are in prose, two partly in verse and partly in prose, and four in verse. Scholars have entertained various theories concerning the origin of these versions, and these are carefully examined by the author of the present article. The chief point of interest in the whole question is the possible authorship of Jehan de Meün, the celebrated author of the *Roman de la Rose*. Questions of plagiarism and literary falsifications greatly complicate a situation already sufficiently complex in itself, and many problems still remain unsolved.

Antoine Thomas. *Étimologies françaises et provençales*. 60 pages. The etymologies of thirty-four words and groups of words are here discussed in detail. They belong to quite a variety of linguistic domains on French soil.

Mélanges. Carlo Salvioni, *Versioni valdostane della parabola del figliuol prodigo tratte dalle carte Biondelli*. A. Jeanroy, *Notes critiques sur Hueline et Aiglantine*. A. Thomas, *Gui de Tournant, chanson de jeste perdue*.

Comptes rendus. V. de Bartholomaeis, *Liriche antiche dell' alta Italia* (G. Bertoni). F. de Gélis, *Histoire critique des Jeux Floraux depuis leur origine jusqu'à leur transformation en Académie, 1323-1694* (M. R.). Alfred Jeanroy, *Les chansons de Guillaume IX, duc d'Aquitaine, 1071-1127* (Giulio Bertoni). Julius Schmidt, *Le Jugement d'Amours* (Edmond Faral).

Correspondance. M. R. replies to M. Jean Acher, *Sur l'x finale des manuscrits*.

Périodiques. *Bulletin de dialectologie romane*, I-IV (G. Millardet). *Revue de dialectologie romane*, I-IV ("A. M. Espinosa, *Studies in New Mexican Spanish* . . . Son étude est sérieuse et remplie de renseignements inédits sur les parlers d'une région qui lui est particulièrement familière".—G. Millardet). *Studi medievali*, III (A. Parducci). *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur*, XXXIX, 1<sup>re</sup> et 2<sup>e</sup> parties (Edmond Faral).

Chronique. Obituary notice of Gustav Körting. *Mélanges Émile Picot*.

Publications annoncées. M. R. Thompson Hill prépare une édition de la *Vie de sainte Euphrosyne* d'après les mss. de l'Arsenal, de Bruxelles, La Haye et Oxford.

Comptes rendus sommaires. 11 titres. John M. Burnam, *Palaeografia iberica*, 1<sup>er</sup> fasc. ("Nous étions jusqu'ici assez pauvres en fac-similés de mss. espagnols et surtout portugais, le recueil de M. B. sera donc le bienvenu".—M. R.) J.-P. Wickersham Crawford, *The Catalan Mascarón and an episode*



in Jacob van Maerlant's *Merlijn* ("L'étude de M. Crawford a le mérite d'attirer de nouveau l'attention sur un sujet intéressant; malheureusement, l'auteur, travaillant en Amérique, n'a pu connaître qu'une partie des textes".—G. Huet).

Octobre.

A. Jeanroy. *La "Sestina doppia" de Dante et les origines de la sextine.* 9 pages. The true sextine is based upon three metrical principles, but Dante has in this poem only applied two of the three. The modifications introduced by Dante are discussed at some length. Riquier was not the inventor of this poetical form, but merely its most celebrated and frequent user.

Lucien Foulet. *Notes sur le texte de Villon.* 27 pages. Villon is the most original and perhaps also the most difficult of Mediaeval authors. In spite of the notable investigations of prominent scholars there yet remains much that is obscure in his text. These difficulties may be divided into four main categories: 1. Historical allusions that escape us largely at the present day; 2. The uncertainty of the text tradition as found in the manuscripts and early editions; 3. Faulty interpretation of passages themselves correct in form; and 4. Misunderstanding of the language, fashions and affectations of the time. Villon was a habitué of the taverns and low places, and his works throw a curious light on the elegant life of the time on its seamy side. The study of his many idiomatic phrases is most intricate and demands a wide range of reading in contemporary literature for purposes of comparison.

Pio Rajna. *Intorno a due antiche coperte con figurazioni tratte dalle storie di Tristano.* 63 pages. Some twenty years ago Contessa Maddalena Guicciardini found in the town of Usella a curious quilt representing in relief scenes from the romance of Tristan with descriptive wording in Gothic characters. Strange to say, a very similar quilt was found a few years later to be on exhibition in the South Kensington Museum in London; and a comparison between them is now made possible by means of the excellent facsimiles published with the present article. The London quilt is larger than that at Usella, and a comparison of the two shows that the latter has lost its border on one side. Thus the London quilt has fourteen scenes, only eight of which are to be found in the other. The scanty text on both quilts is also published in this article, and discussed at great length both from a literary and a linguistic point of view. The dialect forms employed appear to point to Sicily and the end of the fourteenth century.

Mélanges. Oscar Bloch, *L'article Entefiner de Godefroy.* J. Jud, *Mots allemands d'origine romane.* Artur Långfors, *Nouveau fragment de la Vengeance Raguidel.* George L.

Hamilton, L'histoire de Troie dans l'art du moyen âge avant le Roman de Troie.

Comptes rendus. Félix Arnaud, Chants populaires de la Grande-Lande et des régions voisines; musique, texte patois et traduction française, tome I (Georges Millardet). Vincenzo de Bartholomaeis, 1. La "metgia" di Aimeric de Peguilhan; 2. Il "conselh" di Falquei de Romans a Federico II imperatore; 3. La canzone "Fregz ni neus" di Elia Cairel; 4. Osservazioni sulle poesie provenzali relative a Federico II (René Lavaud et A. Jeanroy). Joseph Bédier, Les légendes épiques; recherches sur la formation des Chansons de geste (Ferdinand Lot). Erhard Lommatsch, Gautier de Coincy als Satiriker (Arthur Långfors). F. Melcher, Fraseologia rumantscha (J. Jud). F. Melcher, Rapport general davart l'idioticon retorumauntsch (J. Jud). H. Schuchardt, Nubisch und Baskisch (J. Jud).

Périodiques. Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie, 23<sup>e</sup>-25<sup>e</sup> année [“Zur altfranzösischen Fabel-literatur”. Sous ce titre G. C. Keidel analyse L. Sudre, Les Fables (dans Petit de Julleville, II, 1-13), Faguet, Histoire de la littérature, 55-8, Suchier et Birch-Hirschfeld, Geschichte der fr. Lit., 201-2; il publie une version inédite du coq et de la perle extraite de l'Image du Monde de Gautier de Metz (B. N. fr. 24428, f° 7 v°, col. 1) et discute contre G. Paris les rapports entre l'Ysopet I et II de Paris et l'Ysopet-Avionnet”.—G. Cohen. Brief notices of R. Weeks, The primitive Prise d'Orange; Origin of the Covenant Vivien; John J. Schlicher, The origin of rythmical verse in late latin; L. F. Mott, The provençal Lyric; Karl Pietsch, Preliminary notes on two old Spanish versions of the Disticha Catonis.]. Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XXXVI, 2-6 (Notice, by L. Foulet, of G. L. Hamilton, La source d'un épisode de Baudouin de Sebourg).

Chronique. Obituary notices of Stanislas Bormans, Arthur Graf, Florian Melcher, L. Passy and Baron Charles de Tournoulon. Publications annoncées. Collections et publications en cours.

Comptes rendus sommaires. 9 titles. Among them 'la cinquième édition de la Littérature française au moyen âge de Gaston Paris', of which "les notes bibliographiques ont été considérablement augmentées par M. Paul Meyer".

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

## BRIEF MENTION.

The sentimental observance of birthdays, universal on the Continent, is still somewhat exceptional in England. In the German annual, *Minerva*, the birthday of each professor is religiously recorded, not as a *memento mori* for the teacher, but as a hint to the taught, and the French *jour de fête* tells its own story. When my coëval, Frederic Harrison, rounded out his eightieth year, he is reported to have celebrated the occasion by taking a long solitary walk and afterwards entertaining chance callers at tea in his rose-garden. But the solidarity of the nations—I remember when the phrase was born—is making itself felt more and more, and tributes of respect and affection in the form of collected essays, so common in France and Germany, are making their appearance more and more frequently in England and America. A busy life of sixty or seventy years, the completion of twenty-five years of academic service, these dates furnish opportunities for manifestations of regard, and occasions of bewilderment to the reviewer. What one reviewer, for instance, would be equal to a characterization of the fifty odd contributions which make up the superb volume of *Essays and Studies* dedicated to that rare genius, WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, on his sixtieth birthday, 6 August, 1913 (Cambridge, At the University Press)? The cover is adorned by an escutcheon—the crest a camel couchant, the motto MIHI GRAVATO DEUS. Nothing more appropriate, crest and motto both, for the average editor in view of all this wealth of content, which no one, I venture to say, could take up so lightly as the honoured scholar to whom the volume is dedicated, himself equally at home in Classics and Archaeology, Mediaeval Literature and History, himself a dominant figure in Anthropology and Comparative Literature. 'Take up so lightly', I have written, for it is the easy mastery of each subject and the flash of native genius that commend RIDGEWAY's writings to those who can only learn from him. As GODLEY says in his dedicatory verses:

Of tedious pedants though the world be full,  
While RIDGEWAY lives, Research can ne'er be dull!

---

A list of these fifty *Essays and Studies* would give the aspect of a catalogue to the pages which I reserve for the

*quisquiliae* of *Brief Mention*, and the fewest of these *Essays and Studies* fall within the narrow range in which I may be supposed to have some right to an opinion. In the whole volume there is scarcely anything that deals with Greek Syntax. True, in his essay on the *Evolution of Primitive Thought*, Mr. S. A. COOK quotes with approval the saying of DRIVER: 'The great masterpieces of Greek literature were all familiar to the scholars of the sixteenth century, and yet some of the most serious blots on the Authorised Version of the New Testament are due to the translators' ignorance of some quite elementary principles of Greek syntax'. But what are the elementary principles of Greek syntax depends very much on the point of view. 'Serious blots' often appear on unauthorized Greek versions of English poems (A. J. P. XXIII 3), and, unwilling as I am to mar the effect of my cordial reception of the volume to which I owe some happy hours of enjoyment and enlightenment, I cannot refrain from one of those reminiscences to which old age is so prone. Nearly a score of years ago an American epigraphist translated ΔΙΑ ΣΩΤΗΡΑ 'By the Saviour' (A. J. P. XVIII 119). The rendering was greeted with shouts of derision by European scholars, whereupon ensued a lamentable attempt to shift the responsibility of what was considered a gross blunder, and that outburst of mockery seems to have had a chilling effect on future publications of the whole series of inscriptions. And now comes Mr. E. HARRISON, who in a discussion of the famous ΔΙΑ ΛΙΘΟΝ admits a possibility of the very rendering that was scouted all those years ago, and indulges in renderings that show a sad vagueness as to the uses of *διά* c. gen. and *διά* c. acc. (A. J. P. XXIV 104).

---

Among the strictly philological articles that make up the RIDGEWAY volume is an essay on the *Platonic Canon*, in which Professor J. L. BEARE has undertaken to readjust the order of the dialogues according to the rôle played in each of them by the famous identification of ἀρετή with ἐπιστήμη. Having just emerged from the reading of MAX POHLENZ, *Aus Platos Werdezeit* (Weidmann, 1913), I am not in a fit condition to discuss Mr. BEARE's thesis, and content myself with noting that as a natural consequence of his reconstruction, the Menexenus is contemptuously banished to the limbo of the spurious dialogues, whereas Herr POHLENZ has consecrated fifty odd pages to the study of the Menexenus as an important document of Plato's early views of history and political life. Such are the variations of Platonism, worse even than the variations of Protestantism. As usual, the great trouble is the ter-

minology. ἐπιστήμη is as hard to translate as Mr. Bury, the Younger, (A. J. P. XXXI 237) found ἔρως to be. Neither 'knowledge' nor 'understanding' is satisfactory, and ἐπιστήμη has been taken over bodily into our metaphysical pantheon like one of Usener's 'opaque gods' (A. J. P. XVII 363), and we speak familiarly of 'epistemology'.

---

In order to awaken in wider circles an interest in Archaeology, the Archaeological Institute of America has undertaken the issue of a new magazine, *Art and Archaeology*, the plan of which is set forth in the first number, which happily initiates the new enterprise:

The purpose of *Art and Archaeology* is to give people, in an interesting and attractive way, the information they wish to have in the wide realm embraced by its name. This information is imparted by interesting reading matter prepared by men and women who are masters in their several fields, and by beautiful pictures produced by approved modern processes. Human interest, timeliness and literary merit are the tests applied in the selection of articles, and artistic quality and appropriateness are the standards in the selection of illustrations.

---

The late Mortimer Lamson Earle, instead of saying that the style of a certain writer, like olives, was an acquired taste, compared it to the palm-pith in the Anabasis (2, 3, 16), with its ἰδιότης τῆς ἡδονῆς. Earle knew the ripe olives of Greece. No acquired taste are they. He was merciful enough not to continue the quotation, καὶ τοῦτο κεφαλαγές. The Anabasis is not often quoted. Like the commentaries of Julius Caesar, the associations are too painful. Outside of 'Gallia omnis' and Κῦρος ἐξελαύνει, which serve the purpose of 'Arma virumque', there is seldom an allusion to either of these classic engines of torture. The boasted ἀφέλεια of Xenophon does not commend itself to the average schoolboy; the humour is very thin, and it is only the advanced student that tastes out the foreign tang in the honey of the Attic bee, or takes to heart the encomium of Aristides. When it was my fortune to teach the Anabasis and correct Greek exercises based on the Anabasis, a favorite pedagogic device, I prepared, as much I must confess for my own sake as for the alleviation of my pupils, a special series of my own in which I narrated the adventures of a camp-follower of the Ten Thousand, whose report, couched in the language of Xenophon and treating of the same events, was not over-favorable to Themistogenes. My restlessness under the task made me anticipate Dürrbach.



There is one passage, however, that everybody knows and everybody cites, the *θάλαττα θάλαττα* passage (4, 7, 24). One would think that celebrity and brevity would secure the famous cry from misquotation, but I was shocked the other day to find it cited as *θάλασσα θάλασσα*. At first the change seems to be a brutal change, but such are the refinements of modern scholarship that I asked myself whether it had not been made wittingly, and *σσ* substituted for *ττ* because of the Arcadians and other rough fellows who composed the Ten Thousand and who were not up to the refinements of the new Attic dialect. In the *περὶ πολιτείας* of Herodes cited in the last number (A. J. P. XXXV 231) there is a *πράσσειν* which may be interpreted either as a conscious archaism or a genuine bit of Old Attic.

---

Quite apart from the scientific results of such secular discussions as those that revolve about the Homeric Question and the Platonic Canon, there is a human, a cultural, a national interest that attaches to the various stages of these debates. The biographies of the disputants, even those of less prominence, would be of service in determining the personal equation. Then the spirit of the times, the stamp of the nationality, must be taken into account. Some years ago I suggested as the subject of a doctoral dissertation—more fruitful than most—a comparison of the *Choephoroi* of Verrall and the *Choephoroi* of Blass (A. J. P. XXX 225). Teichmüller's *Literarische Fehden* was a more living book to me because I was not unacquainted with the philological feuds of Germany. A peaceful soul, I am at the same time a sympathetic soul, and whilst Teichmüller's identification of Dionysodoros in the Euthydemus with Lysias is one of those 'ingenious but not convincing' (A. J. P. XXXIII 490) theories that provoke dissent as well as challenge admiration, I never read that Shrovetide play, as Gomperz calls it, without adding some feeble arguments of my own in support of Teichmüller's cryptic theory. Lysias was named after his grandfather Lysanias, of which Lysias is only 'for short'; and *λυσανίας* (Nub. 1162) is a fitting epithet of Dionysos, even if it is not one of the regular eponyms like the kindred *Λναῖος*. This is a line of study which does not demand the genius that von Stein requires of the student of Plato—'that ideal author for ideal readers.' The only requisite is a susceptibility for plays on words, which is denied to few of my countrymen. There is a special treatise by Max. Scholl, *De verborum lusu ap. Platonem*, Bayreuth Programm, 1899; but Scholl cannot be said to have exhausted the subject.

Here is a note written before Havers (A. J. P. XXXIV 237) had adopted my 'sympathetic dative' and introduced it into learned society. It may still have a little more than personal interest.

---

In Greek, I said to myself, we must look to the ruder language of inscriptions for glimpses of the popular feeling. 'A whip for the horse, a bridle for the ass and a rod for the fool's back' (Prov. 26, 2). To us these are simple datives, but we are a little startled when we find inscriptional datives that tell of 'nails for the door' (Meisterhans<sup>3</sup>, p. 209). Even in the personal domain scholars have balked at the dative *οἱ*, and would fain make it a genitive, not appreciating the intrusion of the dative into the very sphere in which it most abounds; so that we are told that in tragic address the dative, not the genitive, is in use, that it is not *τέκνον μου* but *τέκνον μοι*. 'C'est à moi' is good French, 'maître à moi' is negro French. I thank the negro for that (A. J. P. XXIII 42). This is one of those devices by which the tragic poet introduces into higher art the language of the people in the interest of life. The tragic poet makes the best of both worlds, hyperepicizes with the one hand and with the other avails himself of the thesaurus of popular speech, and as the *τραγικώτατος* of the Great Three, Euripides overdoes it. It is to the tragic poet that we owe the literary sanction of historical present and articular infinitive. Of course, this is a line of study which comparative grammarians are prone to treat with disdain as unscientific. Not long ago, to my delight, I was cast out of the synagogue of orthodox grammarians, followed, it is true, by bouquets of artificial flowers of rhetoric. Of course, syntax is not excluded from the domain of those who lead in the linguistic study of Greek, but they are puzzled by attempts to get a moral significance out of it by what may be called the aesthetic school, and so Kretschmer winds up his notice of Kieckers (A. J. P. XXX 234) with the remark: 'Der Imper. Aor. hat doch wohl für höflicher als der des Praes. gegolten' (Glotta III, 1912, S. 342). This is hardly in conformity with the usual statement as to the use of the tenses, but I am not in love with the usual statements. Aristophanes uniformly employs *βάλλ' ἐς κόρακας*—what I should call the present of impatience as contrasted with the aor. of urgency. There is not much question of courtesy in that case.

---

The latest contribution of that indefatigable explorer, M. RAOUL DE LA GRASSERIE (A. J. P. XXVII 360, XXVIII 234), to

the study of linguistics is entitled *Du Verbe, comme générateur des autres parties du discours (du phénomène au nomène)*, notamment dans les langues indo-européennes, les sémitiques et les ouralo-altaïques (Paris, Maisonneuve). I give the title in full, as it saves the trouble of an analysis of the volume, the bulk of which is made up of long lists of verbal and nominal radicals taken from various authorities, all in support of M. DE LA GRASSERIE's main thesis. It is an old quarrel, this quarrel for precedence between the noun and the verb, and M. DE LA GRASSERIE cites high authority for either side; but he thinks that the evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of the verb, and there is no such compromise as in the droll *Bellum Grammaticale* of Spangenberg (A. J. P. VIII 253), or rather of Guarna. Spangenberg, it appears, was a German 'bummer', a term made familiar by our Civil War, who looted the Italian scholar (A. J. P. XXVII 10), and it was apropos of our Civil War that I gave in the *Atlantic Monthly* for September of 1897 the following summary of Spangenberg-Guarna:

In Spangenberg's Grammatical War the nouns and the verbs are the contending parties. Poeta is king of the nouns, and Amo king of the verbs. There is a regular debate between the two sovereigns. The king of the verbs summons the adverbs to his help, the king of the nouns the pronouns. The camps are pitched, the forces marshalled. The neutral power, the participle, is invoked by both parties, but declines to send open assistance to either, hoping that in this contest between noun and verb the third party will acquire the rule over the whole territory of language. After a final summons on the part of the king of the verbs, and a fierce response from the rival monarch, active hostilities begin. We read of raids and forays. Prisoners are treated with contumely, and their skirts are docked as in the Biblical narrative. Treachery adds excitement to the situation. Skirmishes precede the great engagement, in which the nouns are worsted, though they have come off with some of the spoils of war; and peace is made on terms dictated by Priscian, Servius, and Donatus.

There is, I repeat, no spirit of compromise in M. DE LA GRASSERIE. True, he grants that there was a period of 'indivision' as he calls it, just such an indivision as I have indicated by the phrase, 'Freeze a verb and you have a noun. Melt a noun and you have a verb'. The process is going on every day in English. Any noun can be made a verb. Such phrases as 'father me no fathers'—much admired of foreigners—are of daily occurrence in the spoken language, and the vulgar daring by which the Greek articular infinitive worked its way into high society (A. J. P. XXIII 11) finds new exemplifications at every turn in our linguistic life. 'Never tempt the illicit rove', sings Burns; but 'rove' is illicit as much so as 'eats', which is one of the latest additions to our vocabulary. This flux and reflux—or, if you choose, melting and freezing—simplifies

certain problems in the syntax of the cases, notably the regimen of the genitive; and the old-fashioned scholar who gives the lead to the noun and the newer school which claims precedence for the verb are not so far apart after all (A. J. P. XXIII 22). Not without interest in connexion with this whole question are the phenomena of 'mnemonic aphasia', as it is called by van Ginneken in his *Principes de linguistique psychologique* (pp. 72-3). It is a familiar fact that proper names, which as a rule make no image in the brain, fade first, as they are the first to go in incipient deafness; and proper names are followed in regular succession by the other parts of speech. All this is painfully reminiscent of the sign that haunted me in my daily promenades on the deck of La Bretagne years ago, 'L'ordre d'abandonner le navire'. Here, then, is the order of abandoning the ship of memory. First, as we have seen, the proper nouns, then concrete substantives, then adjectives, then verbs, and of the verbal forms last of all the infinitive. The first to come are the last to go, as often happens at entertainments. The order is the order of mobility. 'Things in motion sooner catch the eye than what not stirs'.

---

Unfortunately, we cannot speak of 'aretalogy', because 'aretalogus' has acquired a bad sense, as is set forth in Reitzenstein's *Wundererzählungen* (A. J. P. XXVIII 238), though Reitzenstein himself, in his review of Norden's *Agnostos Theos* (NJB 1913. 2) seems to have modified his view of the later use of ἀρεταί. If there is great virtue in 'if', there is also a great 'if' in 'virtue', or rather in ἀρετή. Indeed, I might take up several pages of *Brief Mention* with the mere rehearsal of recent discussions of the word; and in certain moods I am inclined to fall in with the dissolving views of that puzzle-headed young gentleman, Menon, before he was gymnotically electrified by Sokrates. There is one kind of virtue of man as there is another kind of virtue of woman. There is one kind of virtue in Pindar, another kind of virtue in Thukydides (A. J. P. XXXIV 232). In Wilamowitz's *Sappho u. Simonides*, wherein is stored material enough for all the *Brief Mentions* possible in my few remaining years, there is a chapter on ἀρετή in Simonides—illuminating as usual, though Wilamowitz's x-rays, like the other x-rays, are sometimes dangerous to the operator. Norden, as I have just remarked, has discussed the subject, and some years ago Deissmann devoted sundry pages of his *Bibelstudien* to it. Now, ἀρετή is what we call an 'abstract', and as I have often remarked (e. g., S. C. G. 41; A. J. P. XVII 356; XXX 235; XXXI 145), and doubtless quite superfluously, the Greek had no word for abstract. If we wish to be truly Greek, the best we can do is to make

an *ἄθροισμα*, collect all the uses of *ἀρετή*, and open our senses to the impression of the composite photograph; the same process that I recommend in the study of the cases. Do not look for moral qualities. 'Die *ἀρετή*', says Wilamowitz, 'ist von Hause aus gar kein sittliches Gut'. It is no more moral in itself than *ἀμαρτία* (A. J. P. XXXIV 233). And do not talk of 'quality'. 'Quality' is an abstract. Plato apologizes for *ποιότης* and is compelled to make a periphrasis for 'relativity' (Theaet. 160 D). *ἀρετή* is a force that may be moral or not. In the Biblical sphere Norden calls it *δύναμις θεοῦ*—Deissmann 'Krafterweisung'. In the strictly Greek sphere I prefer 'efficiency', *ἀρεταί* 'manifestations of efficiency'. The agnostic translation 'prowess' is the best rendering, if there must be a rendering. The Thukydidean sense of 'generosity' is simply an exemplification of his pitiless insight, not to say sardonic humour. 'Generosity' is nothing but an assertion of superiority. Virtue, or rather *ἀρετή*, is distressingly aristocratic. Plato's *τὸ τὰ αὐτοῦ πράττειν* is a challenge to the rest of the world on the part of the superman.

---

ANGELO TACCONE, the well-known student of Greek lyric poetry (A. J. P. XXV 353), and editor of Bakchylides (A. J. P. XXVII 471), has published a special translation of the *Fourth Pythian of Pindar*—the ode that has tempted so many hands. In one of those pithy sentences that enliven his *Bibliographie pratique* (A. J. P. XXXV 109) M. Masqueray says: 'Pindare n'est grand poète qu'en grec'; and apropos of Pindar I have been guilty of some reflexions on the subject of translation generally (I. E. xxvii). This pessimistic attitude, however, has not kept me from occasional lapses into the practice of that fascinating art, though I have left directions in huggermugger to inter all those specimens of a misplaced activity. A judgment of translations is almost necessarily limited to the transfer into one's native tongue, and I do not arrogate to myself any such similar sensibility to the idioms of the various foreign languages with which one has to deal in literary work. In the latest edition of his *Kunst des Uebersetzens* PAUL CAUER considers Wilamowitz's renderings as well as Bardt's eine erfreuliche Erscheinung. Hildebrand is of a different opinion. When noted scholars differ, who made me a judge? BARDT, for instance, whose rhymed translation of Horace's Satires has reached a fourth enlarged edition, may be right in choosing the 'Knittelvers' for his rendering of Horace's Iter Brundisium instead of the normal decasyllable employed in other satires (C. BARDT, *Die Sermonen des Q. Horatius Flaccus*, Berlin, Weidmann). It 'crisps my nerves', but I am not entitled to an opinion. And so in TACCONE's case I can only



say, as I said in the case of Fraccaroli (A. J. P. XV 502), that Italian seems to me an exceptionally good medium for a translation of Pindar. What interests me in TACONE's version is his interpretation of the ode in which he emphasizes the rôle of Euphamos and avoids the blunder of identifying Jason with Damophilos. Jason, he says, is held up to Arkesilas as a model of generosity to an enemy, a worse enemy than Damophilos could ever have been. In the apologue TACONE takes the oak to be Damophilos, but he reads into the parallel the suggestion made by other commentators in connexion with the Jason-Damophilos business that there is a covert warning lest Damophilos, if rejected, might make a desperate attempt to win his repatriation by force of arms. This carries an old man back to the time of the carbonari and the professional Italian *esule*.

---

That the Journal makes its appearance within the limit prescribed by the Post Office Department is due to the kind offices of my friend and colleague, Professor C. W. E. MILLER, who has superintended the present issue with his characteristic faithfulness and exactness. The copy for *Brief Mention* was furnished before my departure for England the end of June. Else that personal section of the Journal would doubtless have been affected by the atmosphere of the Great War. A bookman all my days, in an autobiographical sketch published many years ago I counted among my losses in Early's Valley Campaign the disappearance of my pocket Homer, and in the first stage of this war I was glad that my Homer was with me, though the matters that interested the contributors to the present number of the Journal did not appeal to me so much as did the parallels between the war before Troy and the war in Belgium. So f. i. when I read of starving Uhlans and defective commissariat, I thought of Odysseus' sage advice: ἀλλὰ πάσασθαι ἀνωχθὶ θοῆς ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιοῦς | σίτον καὶ οἶνοιο· τὸ γὰρ μένος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀλκή. However, literature soon palls at such crises of fate, and I actually resented an article in the London Times dealing with the rôle of the Low Countries in English fiction. The Civil War came back to me with all its horrors, and imagination reinforced memory. Here again I had an illustration of the curious way in which trivialities make and leave disproportionate impressions in times of stress. A postcard from Louvain which crossed and recrossed the Atlantic with a complaint of the tattered condition of one number of the Journal and the miscarriage of another, reached me only a few days before the University of Louvain ceased to be and perhaps the sender also,—an unforgettable incident.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 W. 27th St., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Aristophanes. The Acharnians of Aristophanes; as played by the Oxford University Dramatic Society of February, 1914; with a tr. into English verse by Rob. Yelverton Tyrrell. New York, *Oxford University Press*. 83 pp. 12°, pap., 40 c. net.

— The Acharnians. Edited from the MSS and other original sources by R. T. Elliott. 286 pp. (H. Milford), *Clarendon Press*. 8°, 14s. net. New York, *Oxford University Press*. \$4.75 net.

Bryant (Rev. E. E.) and Lake (E. D. C.). An elementary Latin grammar. New York, *Oxford University Press*. 115 pp. 12°, 40 c. net.

Caesar (Caius Julius). C. Iuli Caesaris commentarii rerum in Gallia gestarum VII; A. Hirti commentarius VIII; ed. by T. Rice Holmes. New York, *Oxford University Press*. 66 + 462 pp. fold. plans. fold. maps. diagrs. 8°, \$2.90 net.

— Gallic War: Books I-II; ed. with notes, summary of forms and syntax, prose composition, and vocabulary by Ernest Riess and Arth. L. Janes. New York, *American Book Co.* 305 + 56 pp. il. pors. fold. map. 12°, 85 c. Combined with Janes' Sight Reading. New York, *American Book Co.* 305 + 238 + 56 pp. il. pors. maps. plans. 12°, \$1.20.

— C. Iuli Caesaris de bello Gallico. Bks. I-VII. New York, *Oxford University Press*. fold. maps. 12°. (Classical authors ed. for schools). 50 c. net.

Cambridge (A. W. Pickard-). Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom. (Heroes of the Nations.) 384-322 B. C. Illustrated. xxiii + 512 pp. *Putnam*. Cr. 8°.

Cicero (Marcus Tullius). De finibus bonorum et malorum; with an English tr. by H. Rackham. New York, *Macmillan*. 29 + 512 pp. S. (Loeb classical lib.). \$1.50 net.

Cornford (F. M.) The origin of the Attic comedy. New York, 1914. 12 + 252 pp. 8°, \$2.40 net.

Heath (Sir T. Little). Aristarchus of Samos, the ancient Copernicus; a history of Greek astronomy to Aristarchus; together with Aristarchus's Treatise on the sizes and distances of the sun and moon; a new Greek text with tr. and notes. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1913. 8 + 425 pp. diagrs. 8°, \$5.75 net.

Hubbell (Harry Mortimer). The influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius and Aristides. New Haven, Ct., *Yale University Press*. 12 + 72 pp. 8°, \$1.25 net.

Kirtland (J. Copeland) and Rogers (G. B.) An introduction to Latin. New York, *Macmillan*. 16 + 261 pp. il. pors. pls. 12°, 85 c. net.

Lamb (Walter R. M.) *Clio Enthroned. A Study of Prose-Form in Thucydides.* 336 pp. *Cambridge University Press.* 8°, 10s. net.

Livy. Titi Livi ab urbe condita; recognoverunt et adnotatione critica instruxerunt Robertus Seymour Conway et Carolus Flamstead Walters. Tomus I. Libri I-V. New York, *Oxford University Press.* Various pages. 12° (Oxford classical texts), \$1 net.

— The Revolt and Fall of Capua. Being selections from Livy, XXIII-XXVI. 208 pp. *Cambridge University Press.* 12°, 2s.

Loew (E. A.) *The Beneventan Script. A History of the South Italian Minuscule.* (H. Milford), *Clarendon Press.* Ryl. 8°, 21s. net.

Martin (Ernest Whitney). *The birds of the Latin poets.* Stanford University, Cal., *Leland Stanford University Press.* 4 + 260 pp. 4° (Univ. ser.), \$1.

Moulton (Fk. Prescott). *Introductory Latin.* Rev. ed. New York, *Heath.* 12 + 282 pp. il. 12°, \$1.

Ovid. Easy stories from the *Metamorphoses*; ed. by B. H. Johnson and R. B. Frith. New York, *Longmans.* 19 + 58 pp. 12° (Stories from the classics ser.), 30 c.

— Elegiac poems; ed. by J. W. E. Pearce. In 3 v. V. 1, The earlier poems; selected from the *Heroides*, the *Amores*, the *Ars Amatoria* and the *Remedia Amoris*. V. 2, The Roman calendar; selections from the *Fasti*. V. 3, Letters from exile; selected from the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. New York, *Oxford University Press.* 12° (Classical authors ed. for the use of schools), 50 c. net.

Plato. *The dialogues of Plato*; tr. in English with analyses and introductions by B. Jowett; with an introd. by Temple Scott. In 4 v. New national ed. New York, *Hearst's International Library Co.* 1740 pp. 12°, \$2.50 net; flex. leath., \$5 net, bxd.

Plutarch's lives; corrected from the Greek and rev. by Arth. Hugh Clough; including historical notes by W. Smith, and an introd. by Temple Scott. In 5 v. New national ed. New York, *Hearst's International Library Co.* 2712 pp. il. 12°, \$3 net; flex. leath., \$6 net bxd.

Riess (Ernest) and Janes (Arth. Lee). *A key to the Latin prose composition exercises in Caesar: Gallic War, books I-II.* New York, *American Book Co.* 18 pp. 12°, pap., 25 c.

Smiley (Ja. Brady) and Storke (Helen S.) *A first year Latin course.* New York, *American Book Co.* 411 pp. il. pors. 12°, \$1.

*Studies in philology*; pub. under the direction of the Philological Club of the University of North Carolina. V. II. Chapel Hill, N. C., *Univ. of N. C.* 80 pp. 8°, pap.

Suetonius Tranquillus (Caius). *Suetonius*; with an English tr. by J. C. Rolfe. In 2 v. V. 2. New York, *Macmillan.* 7 + 556 pp. S. (Loeb classical lib.) \$1.50 net.

Terence. *Phormio.* Edited by John Sargeant. (Pitt Press Series.) 154 pp. *Cambridge University Press.* 12°, 3s.

Thomson (J. A. K.) *Studies in the Odyssey.* New York, *Oxford University Press.* 262 pp. 8°, \$2.50 net.

Weigall (A. E. P. Brome). *The Life and Times of Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt.* London, 1914. 430 pp. 8°, 16s. net.

Wild (H. D.) and others, eds. *A selection of Latin verse; a compilation of the best Latin poetry of all periods for students.* New Haven, Ct., *Yale University Press.* 134 pp. 16°, 75 c. net.

Xenophon. *Cyropaedia*; with an English tr. by Wa. Miller. In 2 v. V. 1. New York, *Macmillan.* 16 + 399 pp. S. (Loeb classical lib.) \$1.50 net.

## FRENCH.

Calleja (F.) L'Education chananéenne de la civilisation grecque. Trad. du maltais. Pet. in-8, 92 pp. Alger, *Imp. A. Jourdan*. 1 fr.

Cavaignac (Eugène). Histoire de l'antiquité. T. III. La Macédoine, Carthage et Rome (330-107), plans et cartes, in-8°. *Fontemoing*. 12 fr.

Dumaine (Ch.) Conversations latines, texte et trad. suivies d'un vocabulaire français-latin, in-16 rel. *Tralin*. 3 fr.

Dussaud (R.) Les civilisations préhelléniques dans le bassin de la Mer Egée, 2<sup>e</sup> édit. entièrement renouv. Gr. in-8, 482 pp., 18 pl. dont 5 en coul., 350 fig. *Geuthner*. 24 fr.

Espérandieu (Em.) Recueil général des bas reliefs, statues et bustes de la Gaule romaine. T. V, in-4, ill. *Id.* 45 fr.

Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes. T. IV, fasc. 5, in-8°, *Leroux*. 3 fr.

Jardé (A.) La Grèce antique et la vie grecque. Géographie, histoire, religion, littérature, beaux-arts, vie publique, vie privée, 84 fig., cartes et grav., in-18. *Ch. Delagrave*. br., 3 fr. 25; cart., 3 fr. 75.

Légrand (Emile), Pernot (Hubert) et Loui-Petit (Mgr.) Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par les Grecs au xviii<sup>e</sup> siècle. T. I, in-8°. *Maisonneuve*. 60 fr.

Marestaing (P.) Les écritures égyptiennes et l'antiquité classique, in-8°. *P. Geuthner*. 7 fr. 50.

Waltz (R.) Manuel élémentaire et pratique de prononciation du latin. *Fontemoing et Cie*. 2 fr.

## GERMAN.

Abhandlungen, Breslauer philologische. Hrsg. v. Prof. Rich. Förster. gr. 8°. Breslau, *M. & H. Marcus*. 47. Heft. Franke (Georgius). Quaestiones Agathinae. (V, 86 S.) 1914. 3.60. 48. Heft. Bielski (Ioannes). De aetatis Demosthenicae studiis Libanianis. (90 S.) 1914. 3.60.

Ballou (Dr. Susan H.) The manuscript tradition of the Historia Augusta. (89 S. m. 3 Taf.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. 3.60; geb. in Leinw. 4.80.

Bechtel (Frdr.) Lexilogus zu Homer. Etymologie u. Stammbildg. homer. Wörter. (viii, 341 S.) gr. 8°. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*, 1914. 10.

Caesar, Des C. Jul., Denkwürdigkeiten üb. den Bürgerkrieg. Hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. Frz. Fügner. (B. G. Teubners Schülerausg. griech. u. latein. Schriftsteller.) Text. 3. Aufl. Hrsg. v. Dir. Dr. W. Haynel. (xxiv, 166 S. m. 9 Abbildgn. u. 2 farb. Karten.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. geb. 1.60.

— Des C. Jul., gallischer Krieg. Hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. Frz. Fügner. Text. 9. Aufl. Hrsg. v. Dir. Dr. W. Haynel. Ausg. B. Mit Einleitg. (B. G. Teubners Schülerausg. griech. u. latein. Schriftsteller.) (xliii, 242 S. m. Abbildgn., 1 Bildnis u. 3 farb. Karten.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. geb. in Halbleinw. 2.

Cauer (Paul). Die Kunst des Uebersetzens. Ein Hilfsbuch f. den latein. u. griech. Unterricht. 5., verm. u. verb. Aufl. Mit e. Exkurs üb. den Gebrauch des Lexikons. (viii, 170 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1914. geb. in Leinw. 4.

Commentationes philologiae Ienenses, ediderunt seminarii philologorum Ienensis professores. gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. Vol. XI. fasc. 2. Rich. J., Maximil.: Priscorum poetarum et scriptorum de se et aliis iudicia. (115 S.) 1914. 4.50.

Curtius Rufus (Q.) Auswahl aus der Geschichte Alexanders des Grossen. Für den Schulgebrauch bearb. u. hrsg. v. Gymn.-Ob.-Lehrern Proff. Drs. J. Dahmen u. G. Stein. (Aschendorffs Sammlg. latein. u. griech. Klassiker.) Kommentar. (172 S.) kl. 8°. Münster, *Aschendorff*, 1914. 1.40.

Deklinationstafel, Lateinische. (System Michaelis.) 91,5 × 115 cm. Farbdr. Giessen, *E. Roth*, 1914. auf Leinw. m. Stäben 8.

Demosthenis orationes ed Carol. Fuhr. (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana.) Ed. maior. Vol. I. kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. Pars 3. Orationes XIX continens. (S. 396-535.) 1.60; geb. in Leinw. 2.

Dessau (Herm.) Inscriptiones latinae selectae. Vol. III. Pars. I. (iv, 600 S.) gr. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1914. 20.

Erbe, Das, der Alten. Schriften üb. Wesen u. Wirkg. der Antike, gesammelt u. hrsg. v. O. Crusius, O. Immisch, Th. Zielinski. Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *Dieterich*. 9. Heft. Borinski, Karl: Die Antike in Poetik u. Kunsttheorie. Von Ausgang des klass. Altertums bis auf Goethe u. Wilhelm v. Humboldt. 1. Mittelalter, Renaissance, Barock. (xii, 324 S.) 1914. 8; geb. 9; in Perg. 12.

Euripides. Ausgewählte Tragödien, f. den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. N. Wecklein. (Griechische u. latein. Klassiker. Schulausg. m. Anmerk.) 12. Bdchn. Iphigenie in Aulis. (xvii, 93 S. m. 1 Taf.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. 1.80; geb. in Leinw. 2.25.

Fischer (Wolfg.) Das römische Lager, insbesondere nach Livius. (vi, 207 S. m. 1 eingedr. Taf.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. 7; geb. in Leinw. 8.50.

Forcellini (Aug.) Lexicon totius latinitatis. Tom. V. Onomasticon totius latinitatis. Tom. I, fasc. 3. Patavii. Leipzig, *Brockhaus & P.*; Rom, *M. Bretschneider*. 3.

Heidemann, Gymn.-Ob.-Lehr. (Dr. Leo). Zum ethnischen Problem Griechenlands. Progr. (24 S.) Lex. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1914. 1.

Heronis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt omnia. Vol. V. Heronis quae feruntur stereometrica et de mensuris. Copiis Guilelmi Schmidt usus ed. Prof. J. L. Heiberg. (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana.) (cxxxvi, 275 S. m. 95 Fig.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. 10; geb. in Leinw. 10.60. II, 2 ist noch nicht erschienen.

Hoffmann (Mart.) Die ethische Terminologie bei Homer, Hesiod u. den alten Elegikern u. Jambographen. (v, 156 S.) gr. 8°. Tübingen, *W. Kloeres*, 1914. 3.50. Hieraus einzeln: II. Hesiod, Elegiker u. Jambographen. (IV u. S. 103-156.) 1.50. Der 1. Tl. ist als Dissertation erschienen.

Homer's Odyssee, griechisch u. deutsch in 2 Bdn. (Tempel-Klassiker.) 8°. Leipzig, Der Tempel. geb. in Leinw. je 4.

Horatius Flaccus, Des Q., Sermonen. Deutsch v. C. Bardt. 4. Aufl. (viii, 258 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1914. 4; geb. 5.

Howald (Priv.-Doz. Ernst). Untersuchungen zur Technik der euripideischen Tragödien. (iii, 75 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *Dieterich*, 1914. 2.40.

Iacobelli (Herminius M.) In campo latinitatis novi flores, subsecivis horis selecti. (Italienisch u. lateinisch.) (124 S.) kl. 8°. Rom, *F. Pustet*, 1914. 2.40.

Kaiser (Gymn.-Prof. Wilh.) Beiträge zur Erläuterung v. Senecas Trostschrift an Marcia. Progr. (22 S.) Lex. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1914. 1.

Kübler (Bernh.) Antinoupolis. Aus dem alten Städteleben. (46 S. m. Titelbild.) 8°. Leipzig, *A. Deichert Nachf.*, 1914. 1.



Kühner (Dr. Raph.) Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. 2. Aufl. gr. 8°. Hannover, *Hahn*. II. Bd. 2. (Schluss-) Tl. Satzlehre in 2 Tln. Neubearb. v. Gymn.-Dir. Dr. Carl Stegmann. 2. Tl. (viii, 738 S.) 1914. 16.50; geb. in Halbfrz. 18.50.

Livi, Titi, ab urbe condita libri. Eine Auswahl des historisch Bedeutsamsten. 1. Bdchn.: Lesestoff aus der 1. Dekade. Kommentar v. Gymn.-Dir. Prof. Dr. Herm. Wiedel. 5. Aufl. (131 S.) 8°. Münster, *Aschendorff*, 1914. 1.10.

— Des Titus Livius römische Geschichte, v. weil. Gymn.-Ob.-Lehr. Prof. Dr. Frz. Fügner. Auswahl aus der 1. u. 3. Dekade. (B. G. Teubners Schülerausg. griech. u. latein. Schriftsteller.) Kommentar. 2. Heft. Buch XXI-XXX. 2. Aufl., besorgt v. Gymn.-Ob.-Lehr. Prof. Dr. Wilh. Heraeus. (iv, 161 S.) 8°. Leipzig *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. geb. 1.60.

Lodge (Gonzalez). *Lexicon Plautinum*. Vol. 1 fasc. VII. (S. 577-672.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. 7.20.

Müller (E.) Cäsaren-Porträts. Bonn, 1914. 8°. 39 pp. Mit Abbildgn. u. 4 Bildnis-Taf. 4.

Naumann (Erich). *De Taciti et Suetonii in Othonis rebus componendis ratione*. Progr. (23 S.) Lex. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1914. 1.

Opitz (Thdr.) u. Weinhold (Alfr.) *Chrestomathie aus Schriftstellern der silbernen Latinität*. Für den Schulgebrauch zusammengestellt. III. Heft: Abschnitte aus Plinius d. Ae. u. Vitruvius. 2., verkürzte Aufl. (iv u. S. 205-281.) 8°. Leipzig *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. 1.

Papyri landanae. Cum discipulis ed. Carol. Kalbfleisch. Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. Fasc. IV. *Instrumenta graeca publica et privata*. Pars II, ed. Georg. Spiess. (S. 125-160 m. 3 Taf. in Phototyp.) 1914. 2.40.

Passow's Wörterb. d. griech. Sprache, neubearb. v. Crönert. 3. Lfg. Gött., Vandenh. & R. Subskr.-Pr. 2.80; in 2. Subskr. 3.40.

Plato's Apologie u. Krito, nebst Abschnitten aus Phaedo, Symposion, Staat. Für den Schulgebrauch hrsg. v. Gymn.-Dir. Dr. B. Grimmelt. 2. Aufl. (*Aschendorff's Sammlg. latein. u. griech. Klassiker*.) (xxxv, 144 S.) 8°. Münster, *Aschendorff*, 1914. geb. nn 1.25.

Poetae latini minores. Post Aemilium Baehrens iterum recensuit Frider. Vollmer. (*Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana*.) Vol. V. (x, 268 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. 3.60; geb. in Leinw. 4. II. 2 u. IV sind noch nicht erschienen.

Probst (Hans). *Studien zur Ilias*. Ueber Homers Erzählkunst. (46 S.) 8°. Nürnberg, *C. Koch*, 1914. 1.

Sachse (Gotthold). *Der Oidipus auf Kolonos des Sophokles u. seine ästhetische Beurteilung*. (30 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1914. 1.

Sallustii in Ciceronem et invicem inactivae. Recensuit Alphons. Kurfess. (*Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana*.) (xvi, 27 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. —.90; geb. 1.20.

Sallustius Crispus (C.) Für den Schulgebrauch hrsg. v. Dr. Jos. Dorsch. (169 S. m. 2 [1 farb.] Karten u. 1 Taf.) 8°. Wien, *A. Hölder*, 1914. geb. 1.20.

— *bellum Iugurthinum*. Für den Schulgebrauch hrsg. v. Dr. Jos. Dorsch. (98 S. m. 2 [1 farb.] Karten u. 1 Taf.) 8°. Wien, *A. Hölder*, 1914. geb. —.80.

Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften von J. Baunack, F. Bechtel, A. Bezzenberger, F. Blass, H. Collitz, W. Deecke, A. Fick, H. van Gelder, O. Hoffmann, R. Meister, P. Müllensiefen, W. Prellwitz. Herausgegeben von H. Collitz und O. Hoffmann. IV. Bd. 4. Heft. II. Abtlg. Göttingen, 1914. 851—1028 pp. 8°, 7.80 m.

Scholia in Theocritum vetera. Recensuit Carol. Wendel. Adiecta sunt scholia in technopaegnia scripta. (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana.) (xl, 408 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1914. 12; geb. in Leinw. 12.80.

Schunck (Gymn.-Prof. Ludw.) Auswahl aus den griechischen Lyrikern. Für den Schulgebrauch hrsg. Kommentar. (Aschendorffs Sammlg. latein. u. griech. Klassiker.) (163 S.) 8°. Münster, Aschendorff, 1914. 1.40.

Sexti Empirici opera. Recensuit Hermannus Mutschmann. (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana.) Vol. II. Adversus dogmaticos libros quinque (adv. mathem. VII-XI) continens. (xix, 429 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1914. 9; geb. in Leinw. 9.80.

Taciti (P. Cornelii) historiarum libri, qui supersunt. Erklärt v. Eduard Wolff. 1. Heft. Buch I u. II. 2., umgearb. Aufl. Mit 1 (farb.) Karte v. H. Kiepert u. 1 Plan v. Rom. (iv, 289 S.) 8°. Berlin, Weidmann, 1914. 3.60.

Thukydides. Erklärt v. J. Classen. II. Bd. 2. Buch. 5. Aufl. Bearb. v. J. Steup. (iv, 330 S.) 8°. Berlin, Weidmann, 1914. 3.60.

Wegehaupt (Dr. Hans). Der Florentiner Plutarch-Palimpsest. Aus: Abhandlg. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Einzelausg. (21 S. m. 4 Taf.) Lex. 8°. Berlin, G. Reimer, 1914. geb. in Halbleinw. b 3.

Wellmann (Max). Die Schrift des Dioskurides *Περὶ ἀπλῶν φαρμάκων*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Medizin. (vii, 78 S.) gr. 8°. Berlin, Weidmann, 1914. 3.

Wiesenthal (Gymn.-Dir. Dr. Max). Wörterbuch zu Xenophons Anabasis in etymologischer Ordnung. (iv, 80 S.) 8°. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1914. 1.

Zander (Carol.). Eurythmia vel compositio rythmica prosae antiquae. Exposuit Z. III. Eurythmia Ciceronis. (xii, 272 S.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, O. Harrassowitz, 1914. 8.

## ITALIAN.

Bianchi (Enrico). La Grecia nella letteratura, nella religione, nel costume, nell'arte. Vol. I: Letteratura. Palermo, 16°, fig., pp. 245. 3.

— Id. Vol. II: Religione, costume, arte. Palermo, 16°, pp. 181. 2.50.

Eschilo. Agamemnone: dramma tragico tradotto in versi italiani da Ettore Romagnoli. Catania, 8°, pp. 118. 2.

Vianello (Natale). Le orazioni di Lisia tradotte e commentate. Torino, 1914. 16°, pp. 526. 10.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Acharnians of Aristophanes. Edited from the MSS and other original sources by Richard Thomas Elliott. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*; New York, *Oxford University Press*. 14s.

American Journal of Archaeology. Second Series. Volume XVIII. No. 2. April-June, 1914. Concord, *The Rumford Press*; New York, *The Macmillan Co.*

Aristarchus of Samos. A History of Greek Astronomy. By Sir Thomas Heath, K. C. B. Med. 8°. Oxford, *University Press* (American Branch, New York). \$5.75.

Art and Archaeology. An Illustrated (Monthly) Magazine. General Editor, D. M. Robinson. Vol. 1, No. 1. July, 1914. Washington, The Archaeological Institute of America. Concord, N. H., *The Rumford Press*. \$2 per annum. Single number, 25 c.

ΑΘΗΝΑ. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἐπιστημονικῆς Ἑταιρείας. Τόμος 25, τεύχος 4. Athens, *P. D. Sakellarios*, 1914.

Bardt (C.) Die Sermonen des Q. Horatius Flaccus. Deutsch. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1914. 4 m.

Bouchier (E. S.) Spain under the Roman Empire. Oxford, *B. H. Blackwell*, 1914.

Cauer (Paul). Die Kunst des Uebersetzens. 5te Aufl. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1914. 4 m.

Certamen Poeticum Hoefftianum, Novem carmina magna laude ornata. Amstelodami, *Apud Io. Mullerum*, 1914.

Coit (Stanton). The Soul of America. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1914. \$2.

Cooke (Reginald C.) Sonnets from Venice. Translated from the German of Platen. Madison, Wisc., 1914.

Dioskurides περὶ ἀπλῶν φαρμάκων. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Medizin von Max Wellmann. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1914. 3 m.

Eastern and Western Review. May, 1914. Boston. @ 20 c.

Euscal-Errijetaco Olgueeta, ta dantzeeen neurrizco-gatz-ozpinduba aita Prai Bartolome Santa Teresa, Durango, *Federico Soloaga-Ren Sillutokijan*, 1914.

Farquhar (George). A Discourse upon Comedy, The Recruiting Officer and The Beaux' Stratagem. Ed by Louis A. Strauss. The Belles-Lettres Series. Boston and New York, 1914.

Fox (W. Sherwood). Notes on Juv. x. 188-9. *Classical Philology* IX. 2, 1914.

Glotta. Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache. Hsbg. von Paul Kretschmer u. Wilhelm Kroll. V. Band, 4. Heft. VI. Band, 2. Heft. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht*, 1914.

Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, by Prof. A. T. Robertson, D. D. New York, *George H. Doran Co.*, 1914. \$5.

Grasserie (Raoul de la). Du verbe comme générateur des autres parties des discours (du phénomène au noumène). Paris, *Jean Maisonneuve et Fils*, 1914.

Indogermanische Bibliothek. III. Abt., Band 1: Güntert (Hermann). Ueber Reimwortbildungen im Arischen und Altgriechischen. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung*, 1914. Paper, 6.80 m; cloth, 7.80 m.

Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae. Edidit Hermannus Dessau. Vol. III, Pars I. Berolini, *Apud Weidmannos*, 1914. 20 m.

Jaeger (W. W.) Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Metaphysik des Aristoteles. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1912. 5 m.

Journal of Hellenic Studies. Vol. XXXIV. Part 1. 1914. London, *Macmillan & Co., Limited*.

Judicial Settlement of International Disputes. Nos. 15 and 16. The Status of the International Court of Justice with an Appendix of Addresses and Official Documents by James Brown Scott. Baltimore, *Am. Soc. for Judic. Settlement of Internat. Disputes*, Feb. and May, 1914.

Kirtland (John Copeland) and Rogers (George Benjamin). An Introduction to Latin. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1914.

Ledl (Artur). Studien zur älteren Athenischen Verfassungsgeschichte. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*, 1914. 10 m.

Loew (E. A.) The Beneventan Script. A History of the South Italian Minuscule. *Oxford University Press*, 1914. 21s.

Martin (Ernest Whitney). The Birds of the Latin Poets. Leland Stanford Junior University Publications. University Series. Stanford University, *Published by the University*, 1914.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur und für Pädagogik. Hsbg. von Johannes Ilberg u. Paul Cauer. 17. Jahrg. 1914. XXXIII. und XXXIV. Bandes 5. u. 6. Heft. Leipzig, Berlin, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914.

Oldfather (W. A.) Roman Comedy. Classical Weekly, May 24, 1914.

Oxford English Dictionary (The). Ed. by Sir James A. H. Murray. TRAIK-TRINK (Vol. X). Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*; New York, *Henry Frowde*, July 1, 1914. \$1.25.

Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology. Vol. XXXVI. Forty-fourth Session. Fifth Meeting. London, *The Offices of the Society*, 1914.

Quellen u. Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters. Fünfter Bd. Erstes Heft. Vom Mittelalter u. von der lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters, von Paul Lehmann. Die Exempla des Jacob von Vitry, von Goswin Frenken. München, *C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Oskar Beck*, 1914. 8.50 m.

Reid (J. S.) The Municipalities of the Roman Empire. Cambridge, *At the University Press*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1913. \$3.75.

Revista de Filología Española. Director: Ramón Menéndez Pidal. Madrid, *Centro de Estudios Históricos*, 1914.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Universidad de la Habana. Vol. XVIII, Núm. 2 (Marzo de 1914); Núm. 3 (Mayo de 1914); Vol. XIX, Núm. 1 (Julio de 1914). Habana, *Imprenta "El Siglo XX" de Aurelio Miranda*.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Hsbg. von August Brinkmann. Neue Folge. 69. Bandes 3. Heft. Frankfurt a. M., *J. D. Sauerländers Verlag*, 1914.

Sandys (Sir John Edwin). Roger Bacon. From the Proceedings of the British Academy. Vol. VI. London, *Humphrey Milford*; Oxford, *University Press* (1914). 1s.

Schmekel (A.) Die Positive Philosophie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Zweiter Band: Isidorus von Sevilla. Sein System und seine Quellen. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1914. 10 m.

Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. Titi Livi ab urbe condita. Recognoverunt et adnotatione critica instruxerunt R. S. Conway et C. F. Walters. Tomus I. Libri I-V. Oxonii, *E. Typographeo Clarendoniano*, 1914. Paper, 3s. 6d; cloth, 4s.; India paper, 5s. 6d.

Sprachwissenschaftliche Gymnasialbibliothek hrsgb. von Max Niedermann. Band VI. Blümel (Rudolf). Einführung in die Syntax. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung*, 1914. Kart. mk. 3.60.

Verrall (A. W.) Collected Literary Essays, Classical and Modern. Ed. by M. A. Bayfield and J. D. Duff, with a memoir. Cambridge, *At the University Press*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1913; \$3.50.

— Collected Studies in Greek and Latin Scholarship. Ed. by M. A. Bayfield and J. D. Duff. Cambridge, *University Press*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1913. \$3.50.

Verslag over den Wedstrijd in Latijnsche Poëzie van het Jaar 1913. Amsterdam, *Johannes Müller*, 1914.

Wendland (P.) Rede auf Friedrich Leo. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1914. 80 pf.

Westaway (F. W.) Latin Quantity and Accent. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1913.

Zeitschrift für französische Sprache u. Litteratur. Hsgb. von Dr. D. Behrens. Band XLII. Heft 6 u. 8. Der Referate u. Rezensionen 3. u. 4. Heft. Chemnitz und Leipzig, *Verlag von Wilhelm Gronau*, 1914.